National Municipal Review

Vol. XXX, No. 6 **Total Number 300**

Published by NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

Contents for June 1941

THE LEAGUE'S BUSINESS ..... *H. P. J.* 318
LETTER TO THE EDITOR 318
EDITORIAL COMMENT ..... *A. W.* 319
NATIONAL DEFENSE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ... *Charles P. Taft* 321
NORTH CAROLINA'S LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION *James W. Fesler* 327
CLEVELAND—POTENTIAL CITY OF A MILLION .. *Christian L. Larsen* 335
BONDED DEBT OF 304 CITIES ..... *Rosina Mohaupt* 341
NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE CITIES ..... *Daniel W. Hoan* 359
RESEARCHER'S DIGEST: JUNE 363
CONTRIBUTORS IN REVIEW 365

NEWS IN REVIEW 366

Editors: *H. M. Olmsted,* City, State, Nation, 366; *Elwyn A. Mauck,* County and Township, 371; *Elwood N. Thompson,* Citizen Action, 375; *Wade S. Smith,* Taxation and Finance, 381; *George H. Hallett, Jr.,* Proportional Representation, 385.

BOOKS IN REVIEW ..... *Elsie S. Parker* 388

The contents of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW are indexed in the *Engineering Index Service,* the *Index to Legal Periodicals,* the *International Index to Periodicals* and in *Public Affairs Information Service.*

COPYRIGHT JUNE 1941 BY
NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

The League's Business

Conference on American Self-Government Reports

The Conference on American Self-Government, through its chairman, C. A. Dykstra, has recently issued a "Progress Report," copies of which are available through the League's office.

League Personalities

Henry L. Shattuck, the League's vice-president, recently paid a visit to the League's office. Other recent visitors have included Mrs. Mark Feder, head of the research division of the Cincinnati City Charter Committee; C. G. Hoag, honorary secretary of the Proportional Representation League; Paul Volcker, manager of Teaneck, New Jersey; Marshall Shulman of the Counsel for Democracy, Walter Cavanaugh, of Delafield and Delafield, New York City, and Mrs. Walter Lake, of the Women's Civic League of Nyack, New York.

The League's former president, Hon. Murray Seasongood, recently has been appointed to the Advisory Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States Supreme Court. He is also chairman of the Ohio committee cooperating with the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Improving the Administration of Justice. In line with his activities in the legal world, Mr. Seasongood recently addressed the Cincinnati Conference on Law and Lawyers in the Modern world. His address, titled "Should the Merit System Be Used in Making Appointments of Lawyers for Public Service?", appears in the *Cincinnati Law Review,* Volume XV, No. 2 (1941).

HOWARD P. JONES, *Secretary*

Letter to the Editor

To the Editor of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW:

Miss Roher's article in the April number on "Education of a Citizen" was one of the most interesting I have read in the REVIEW for some time.

After five years' experience as a public official, I am completely convinced that the need for citizen understanding of local government transcends any of its purely technical aspects.

We in Montclair have been experimenting with many devices for arousing the interest of citizens and giving them facts as to their own collective problems. Personally, I have never been convinced that the annual report in the form generally used is an effective instrument. Miss Roher's research in Palo Alto seems broadly to confirm this impression. Why should this be so? One, of course, can only guess, but I am inclined to believe that no matter how attractively gotten up, it attempts to cover too much territory.

In these fast moving days the average person's mind is overwhelmed; consciousness is dulled; capacity to receive is limited; subconscious influences on the mind are rife. Our experience would indicate that a letter or very brief pamphlet in a sealed envelope and, if possible, personally addressed (modern mailing

(Continued on Page 365)

National Municipal Review

Editorial Comment

"I Am an American"

IN PRIMITIVE days on this and other continents it was an important day when the young men reached maturity and were ushered into full-fledged tribal membership.

On Sunday, May 18, three-quarters of a million people gathered in New York City's Central Park to celebrate the modern version of such an occasion. Other thousands participated in exercises in hundreds of other cities in what was called "I Am an American Day."

There was one important difference between the tribal ceremony and many of those which were held in the United States last month. That difference was in the preliminary preparation.

It was not without good sound reason that early communities followed the custom of painstakingly schooling their youth in tribal customs and traditions, of making them prove their fitness, and of making them aware of the responsibilities as well as the privileges which would be theirs. They knew from bitter experience that a nation which lacked intelligent participation by its members was unlikely to survive.

Two years ago, in Manitowoc, Wisconsin, the forerunner of this year's celebrations was held. There were bands, a parade, and oratory. But the celebration was preceded, over a period of some weeks, by meetings, discussions, and study by groups of young people turning twenty-one. By these means they developed an understanding of their local governments. They learned about the relation of local government to county, state, and national governments. But above all they developed a basic understanding of their privileges and responsibilities as citizens, an awareness of their individual importance in a self-governing system, and an understanding that local governments are the roots of that system.

The thoughtful professor who planned and helped arrange this first ceremony was fully conscious that he might be starting something which would become national in scope, and he realized also that many would be tempted to eliminate the preliminary "tribal training" period, which involves work and effort, and let what was intended to be merely the culminating ceremony stand alone.

Probably with the hope of helping to preserve the meaningful purpose of this observance, he named the affair "Citizenship Day." But when the idea promptly challenged national attention and a joint resolution was on its way through Congress calling upon the President to set aside a day as "Citizenship Day," someone decided to put "oomph" into the proposition by changing the name to "I Am an American Day."

There is no wish in this discussion to belittle the value of the many addresses made by thoughtful, patri-

otic men and women on this year's "I Am an American Day." They were important and they unquestionably stirred many people from the matter-of-fact indifference which probably is our greatest weakness.

But we might well consider whether such celebrations are enough. We aren't living in that kind of a world any more. The totalitarian nations have inoculated their youth with a virus which intends death to our way of life. Bands, speeches, and momentary thrills of patriotism will no more stand against that virus than did the Maginot line. We need not regiment our youth and amputate their powers of independent thought; but must we not supply all possible opportunity to gain information and inspiration which will lead to a complete, positive understanding of what it means to be privileged to say, "I am an American!"?

This opportunity is provided in the pattern set and thoroughly tested in Manitowoc County. It lays great stress on the importance of the preliminary preparation and training and proves that, with adequate planning, organization, and effort, a continuous program of civic education can be conducted successfully.

We All Have to Pay Some Time

FEW families, when planning to move into a community, do a very scientific job of testing it as a good place in which to live or of comparing prospective income with prospective expenses and the ability to purchase necessities and to enjoy conveniences.

Such inquiry as they make usually is confined to the adequacy of the schools and the amount of taxes or rents. While these are sound tests, as far as they go, they don't necessarily provide assurance that the schools and other services will continue to be adequate or that taxes and rents will remain bearable.

Size and nature of public debt is a clearer index of a community's ability to maintain its equipment and services without going beyond the ability of the taxpayer to foot the bill. Some high-debt cities like Jersey City also pay high taxes, which is at least realistic; others, like Philadelphia, have been proud of their ability to keep property taxes low, even at the expense of rundown equipment and payless paydays for public employees. But, with the income from its gas works pledged to cover borrowing and with a tax on payrolls, Philadelphia is learning at last that there is always a day of reckoning and that it's somewhat painful.

Few cities are as fortunate as Kalamazoo, Michigan, which, as the result of long and careful planning, owes no money except for schools; Kalamazoo, indeed, is still the proud possessor of the distinction of being the only debt-free, pay-as-you-go city in the United States over 50,000 population, if it is fair to consider school debt separately as being beyond the control of the regular city administration.

In the comparison of the debts of cities over 30,000 population which is

(Continued on Page 346)

National Defense and Community Service

"On the home front we now have the challenge and the opportunity to strengthen our American way of life."

By CHARLES P. TAFT
Assistant Coordinator of Health, Welfare and Related Defense Activities

Construction Started on New Naval Station

Local Plants Get Army Contracts

Six Troop Trains Daily — 20,000 Men on Post in 6 Weeks

Nearby Defense Orders Reach New High

HEADLINES like these have made the front pages of local newspapers — east, west, north, and south—during recent months. Everywhere they have caused local citizens to point with pride. And well they might, for they mean that the American people have taken a prompt, firm hold on the military and industrial problems of national defense.

The newspapers carrying these banner heads have often contained other items relative to defense; but these, at least until recently, have occupied modest corners of inside pages and want-ad columns:

Boys from Camp Throng Main Street; Tie Up Saturday Night Traffic

Wanted: Sleeping Accommodations by three young men employed at airplane plant; willing to share room

Ten Stranded Families Housed at City Mission

School and Hospital Authorities Warn Limits of Capacity Exceeded

For Sale: Used auto trailers. Beat the rent racket

These bits, hidden in back pages during the past winter, were forewarnings of problems to come in American defense communities — problems that could be, and were, predicted but that somehow had to be seen to be believed.

Recreation, health, welfare, education, housing — these needs and others like them have been accepted as components of the national defense program ever since it got under way last June. Their national importance and local impact have been widely recognized. The federal government, as well as the states and their local communities, have accepted the fact that these home-front problems of defense can be met only by sharing responsibility and pooling resources.

But it is one thing to accept the fact that community service is an essential sector in national defense—and quite another thing to foresee where the pressures are going to come in your own home town. Running head on into the major crises created by thousands of soldiers in town to spend their leave and with no place to go, or by thousands of new industrial workers scrambling for a place to live, local communities are saying: "So *this* is what happens

on the home front in national defense."

Yes, this — and much more — is what happens. These — and many more—are the problems that the American people are now called upon to face. The home-front program through which they are tackling these problems calls for, and has a place mapped out for, the coöperation of every level of government, of every interested private agency, and of every citizen who recognizes his personal stake in this great effort. And that takes in just about all of us — 130,000,000 strong.

Coordinator's Office Set Up

Any effort of that magnitude calls for a clear-cut framework of operation. To build and to maintain such a framework, the Office of Federal Coördinator for Health, Welfare, Recreation, and Related Activities was set up and integrated with the Federal Security Agency. Since the latter already had continuing responsibilities in the broad fields of social security, public health, and education, it is well equipped to take on this additional emergency task.

But the federal coördinator's office cannot do the job alone—and has no intention of trying. This policy is dictated not by expediency but by fundamental obligations. The federal share in this undertaking looks toward two objectives: first, to clear the tracks for united, effective nationwide action; second, to stand behind and strengthen the state and local governments and the national and local voluntary organizations that are on the front line of home defense.

To tie together all federal agencies and facilities touching any part of this program, the Coördinator has asked the agency heads to serve as a Federal Advisory Council. Counting both members of the Federal Security Agency and others, these number something over twenty and represent a revealing cross-section of the federal contribution to the community life of the nation—from public health to park service, from Office of Education to the Federal Works Agency. The only gap in this existing framework for national coördination was in the area of recreation. For that alone a new federal unit has been set up—a small, intensive planning and field staff in the Coördinator's office.

As a channel for its field operations, the coördinator's office has utilized the regional set-up of the Social Security Board. The board's twelve regional directors, acting as regional coördinators, promote coöperation among field representatives of federal agencies, between the federal government and the states, and between the public and private agencies concerned.

These last are an important part of the recreation picture—important because the services voluntary agencies are prepared to give are needed, and equally because voluntary action is one of the essentials of democratic self-service. Together these two—public action through government and private action through voluntary groups—make up the pattern of American life. We must utilize both as fully, as effectively, as we know how if we are to accomplish the job before us.

One important step in this direc-

tion was taken recently when six national religious and welfare organizations came together to form an over-all planning body in the field of leisure-time and morale activities. Incorporated as the United Service Organizations for National Defense, its members are the YMCA, the YWCA, the National Catholic Community Service, the Jewish Welfare Board, the Salvation Army, and the National Travelers Aid Association. The United Service Organizations will operate within the general framework set up by the Federal Coördinator, a major part of its job being to help fill the local gaps in leisure-time activities and other services for men in the armed forces and for men and women in defense industry.

These gaps are very real—and very empty. The army and navy provide ample and adequate recreation on their posts; but when a soldier has leave, he "goes to town." And too often the towns are swamped.

In communities where this situation is most acute, the federal government will help to set up service club facilities. The buildings to house these centers will be provided out of federal funds anticipated under the pending community facilities bill. Some will be operated by the local communities, and about three hundred will be leased to and operated by the USO. In taking on responsibility for staffing and running these clubs, the USO has assumed a heavy obligation, and one in which it will need the full support of the American people—in money, in interest, and in service. Men and women volunteers, serving under the USO and other organizations in every community, will be called on to do the thousand and one things entailed in providing worthwhile, wholesome surroundings for our defense forces, both civil and military.

That is the over-all plan for recreation. We believe it is a good one—as simple, direct, and clear cut as can be devised in an enterprise involving so many activities; comprehensible and flexible to meet complex and diversified problems.

Plan in Action

But no plan, however good, can be judged by its paper appearance. The test comes when the plan and the people meet. And the place where that happens is on Main Street—in the towns and cities of America. Since no two of these towns and cities are precisely identical, the program, as it is actually getting down to work throughout the country, varies in line with local situations.

Some cities, with reasonably adequate community resources and leadership, are equipped to handle their own emergency problems. If so, that is the way the job will be done. Coördination will consist simply of keying such local projects into the national picture.

For example, a city of 88,000, near which several large army posts are located, early recognized that it had an obligation to the soldier on leave. The main need was a place in the center of town where soldiers could make their headquarters. A soldiers' service center was set up, under an experienced director and a full-time hostess. Serving the soldiers at a rate which tops 3,000 each week-end it provides: a canteen, showers, toi-

lets, and lockers; a free check room; rooms for reading, writing, resting, playing games, and meeting friends; a library and a lounge with radio and newspapers, including ninety hometown papers.

Special services offered by the center include: general information and daily bulletin of activities for soldiers; stamps, cards, free notary service on pay days; housing service, listing rooms or houses at reasonable rents for families and friends of soldiers; church contact service, to inform boys of all denominations of services, and to coöperate with churches in arranging dinners, entertainments, dances, etc.; dancing—regular weekly Saturday night dance, smaller dances (often as many as three a night), and dance instruction; booking games for camp basketball teams in twelve in-town gyms (wind-up tournament scheduled); "talent" service for entertainment at ten regiment recreation centers.

Small Cities Overwhelmed

What that one city has done, many cities can and are already doing; still others are in the process of rounding up their community resources. But in some places the community alone cannot master the situation. It may need only suggestions and guidance. It may need some supplementation—from the Federal Coördinator's Office or from the United Service Organizations working within the coördinated plan. It may be completely submerged. The new problems dumped in its lap by defense activity may be of a size and kind which it has never before even dreamed of—much less expected to encounter.

This is particularly true of the small country towns which are suddenly finding themselves the free-time Mecca for the enormous new army camps now located in what were once backwoods areas and wide open spaces of the south and west. One such community consists of a local "metropolis"—called for purposes of anonymity "Exton"—and two neighboring villages. Normally the population totals about 30,000. Nearby, with no other towns within reach, are four major army camps into which troops are pouring—close to 90,000 by June, about one-tenth of them Negroes. With the troops come also civilians attracted mainly by soldiers' pay-checks. The newcomers, counting both civilians and military, in this community outnumber the "old-timers" by three to four times.

Practically every community service and facility early reached emergency status in Exton and its neighbors. Housing is a major issue. That is not our responsibility, but belongs to the Federal Defense Housing Coordinator. Nevertheless, what he does determines largely what we may try to do in the Coördinator's Office. In 1940, according to a United States census estimate, there were some two hundred rental properties in the entire district—or just about one per cent of its total dwellings. Rents have skyrocketed. Local families of lower income levels have been crowded out. Some civilian workers are traveling up to a hundred miles a day getting to and from their jobs; others are living in boxcars. Several

housing projects are scheduled, but progress is hampered by the fact that available land is low and requires drainage before building can be started. Other major pressures are on water supply, sewage disposal, sanitation, food and milk inspection; malaria control, and hospital and school facilities. Those we can help on, through the United States Public Health Service and the Office of Education. Police service, highways and traffic control are problems for the state and its local subdivisions. While progress has been made on all these fronts, the "before and after" contrast is particularly striking in the leisure-time picture.

Up to recent months, recreation as an organized community concern in Exton was pretty much of a desert, punctuated by a few small oases. There was no public recreation whatsoever—no YMCA or YWCA. Several religious and welfare organizations had small centers which more or less supplemented church activities and social clubs. The Chamber of Commerce had set up a military affairs committee soon after plans for the new camps were completed. That was the sum total of the town's leisure-time resources. In spite of their best efforts, the townspeople could not keep pace with new demands. Not only were resources lacking; experience and leadership in this field were equally minus quantities. Tax limitations and the low level of most earnings and incomes made both public and private money-raising difficult.

Saturday night in Exton became a hazardous experience for everyone concerned. Men on leave crowded the sidewalks, the one movie was swamped, cars tangled the business street from end to end, the railroad station offered the only free rest rooms, its benches were the only available place to sit and rest—especially for Negro soldiers, the young girls from surrounding towns who had come in to take jobs as waitresses and so on had chances for "dates" which many of them were reluctant—and some were too willing—to accept, questionable taverns and a "Palais de Dance" added further complications.

Community Program Mapped

The churches and clubs individually did what they could; but these scattered efforts could hardly add up to more than a drop in the bucket. It was not until March of this year, when a field representative from the Federal Coördinator's Office paid his first visit to Exton, that a concerted effort was made to bring order out of this chaos. He recommended that service-club quarters, operated under the federal program, be set up as soon as possible. Meantime, however, something had to be done at once. With the federal field representative's coöperation, a community program was outlined, and is rapidly being put into operation. Two citizens' committees were formed, representing the Negro and the white population and serving these groups of soldiers. Recreation centers for both white and Negro soldiers were organized. The city provides rent, heat, and light; the NYA gave furniture; the WPA furnishes janitor service, hostesses, and a recreation leader from its state staff; and the

city's business men have underwritten a $500 monthly contribution for running expenses.

Another particularly urgent need is also being met: the town had no decent place for Negro soldiers to eat. A restaurant operator, to whom the federal representative put the problem, lost no time in renting space, installing equipment, and opening for business.

Exton's city park, including an auditorium and swimming pool, has also been tied into the community program. Other local provisions for soldiers' in-town leisure include Saturday night dances given by a citizens' committee, church entertainments and special activities such as a soldiers' chorus, and free week-end dramatic performances given by a little theater group.

This is by no means a perfect solution. Exton has had to do plenty of patchwork and pinch-hitting. But it does show how far one small community can go on its own power when it becomes almost overnight a center of military concentration. Experience here and in similar communities throughout the country dramatizes the nation-wide need for local community planning to meet leisure-time needs. And it indicates, more clearly than any amount of paper planning, how and where a national program can help to tie together and strengthen the local efforts of interested citizens and groups, without impairing local initiative or weakening local responsibility.

Recreation, of course, represents only one sector of the over-all plan—only one factor in the complex of problems that defense has brought to our home towns, big and little. But what has been done on this sector is important, not merely because it fills what might otherwise have been either a serious gap or a no man's land of conflicting activities; it is significant because it embodies in one enterprise practically all the principles and procedures which lie behind our total effort. It entails the closest coöperation among all levels of government, among many private groups, and between government and private agencies. It calls for the service of both professional and volunteer workers. It brings national perspective and national resources to bear upon community needs and the well-being of individuals.

The question of community responsibility *versus* national responsibility has been hotly argued in this country for a long time now—never more hotly perhaps than in the past ten years. Indeed, these debates seem on the whole to have radiated more heat than light—possibly because the question itself contains more friction than fact. Why not community responsibility *plus* national responsibility? Certainly this is a more realistic and a vastly more profitable point of view. No one today questions that this country must present a united front to the world. No one questions that we must utilize all our resources in maintaining that which we would defend. On the home front, we now have the challenge and the opportunity to strengthen our American unity and way of life, and of proving once again that democracy can preserve its own.

North Carolina's Local Government Commission

Achievements include reduction in interest rates, prevention of unwise contraction of debt, preparation of sound refinancing plans.

By JAMES W. FESLER
University of North Carolina

STATE centralization has progressed further in North Carolina than in any other state in the Union. The state government has assumed responsibility for maintenance of an eight months' school, construction and maintenance of all public roads except city streets, and custody of all able-bodied, male convicts sentenced for terms of thirty days or more.

This highly significant shifting of local functions to state operation occurred in 1931-33 as, in part, a recognition of the need for relieving local tax units of burdens that they could not carry under depression conditions.

Drastic measures for state control of local finance were also instituted. No halfway measures could have met the extraordinary problems of widespread defaults on local government debts. As early as 1928 the State Tax Commission had seen that "the inevitable drift" of several counties was "in the direction of insolvency."[1]

Even at that time the composite debt of all units in Carteret County amounted to 38 per cent of the assessed value of its property, and by 1929 it had risen to 42½ per cent.[2] Another unusual situation was that of Buncombe County, where the 1931 combined debt was $482 per capita,[3] and the overlapping debt of its largest city, Asheville, amounted to $845 per capita![4]

These were exceptional cases. But if we accept the rule that combined debt of local units in a county should not exceed 12 per cent of the value of taxable property (a rule followed by the New York law regulating savings banks' investments), then in forty-three of North Carolina's one hundred counties the local government debts were excessive.

Excessive total debt was not the only problem. Many a term bond was to come due during the depression. In some cases the sinking fund that was theoretically to pay these bonds was non-existent; in other cases the sinking funds had been put into real estate, personal loans, and other unreliable investments; in still others, where the sinking funds were in the form of cash on deposit in local banks, the collapse of the banks in the early years of the depression tied these funds up so that they were unavailable.

Even those local governments

[1]North Carolina Tax Commission, *Report*, 1928, p. 26.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 603; and same author, *Report*, 1930, p. 235.

[3]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Financial Statistics of State and Local Governments: 1931—North Carolina* (1934).

[4]Frank A. Neff, *Trends in Municipal Finance Since 1900* (1938), p. 164.

that had used serial bonds were embarrassed by the depression, for often several serial bond issues were not properly coördinated to provide an equal load for the years to follow. Unfortunately, some of the heaviest obligations fell due in the depression years. In 1930 the State Tax Commission estimated that during the eleven-year period to follow sixty cents out of the state and local tax dollar would have to go for debt service obligations.[5]

The problem of heavy debt service obligations was complicated by other familiar features of the depression. The ordinary operations of the local units had to continue; in fact, there was an insistent demand for new and increased services, particularly as to relief of the unemployed. At the same time property values fell, revenues based on former property tax rates drastically decreased, and a substantial resistance developed to local governments' attempts to increase the tax rate and to enforce the collection of taxes due.

This combination of circumstances resulted in chaos in local government finance in North Carolina. A wave of defaults set in that reached its peak by mid-1933 when sixty-two of North Carolina's one hundred counties and 152 of her 260 cities and towns were in default on their debt payments.

The state government could not be expected to ignore this situation. Quite apart from its paternalistic concern for local units, its own credit was likely to suffer as a result of local government defaults. Earlier experiments with mild restrictions on local financial operations had failed to remedy local situations.

A constitutional limitation on the county tax rate for general expenses had only led to multiplication of funds raised for "special purposes," excessive use of tax-anticipation notes, and unwise resort to long-term borrowing.

Earlier Commissions

A County Government Advisory Commission established in 1927 had been restricted to purely advisory powers (except that contracts for audits by public accountants required the commission's approval). It served, in its own words, simply as "a clearing house of information for county officers."

In 1929 the State Sinking Fund Commission, composed of the governor, state treasurer, and auditor, had been authorized to approve every bond and note issue (except short-term tax anticipation notes) of counties, cities, towns, and special districts, and had also been authorized to market such bonds and notes. But two years of experience with this arrangement made it clear that such a commission lacked the time and knowledge essential to intelligent appraisal and selling of proposed bond issues of local units.

In 1931 the Local Government Commission was created to absorb the local government functions of the County Advisory Commission (which was abolished) and of the

[5]North Carolina Tax Commission, *Report*, 1930, p. 242. The statement assumed that the total tax bill would remain stabilized at the 1930 level.

State Sinking Fund Commission.[6] The Local Government Commission is "a separate and distinct division of the Department of the State Treasurer." The commission has nine members, of whom four are *ex officio* and five are part-time members appointed by the Governor. The Governor's appointees hold office at his pleasure. Two of these appointees must have had experience in local government—one as member of a county board of commissioners, and the other as chief executive officer or member of the governing body of a city or town.

Commission's Setup

The four *ex officio* members are elective state officials: the state auditor, state treasurer, secretary of state, and commissioner of revenue. These four constitute the executive committee of the commission, and as such are vested with all the powers of the commission proper, except when the commission itself is in session. As the commission is required to meet only once in every quarter, the executive committee is a very powerful body.

The state treasurer is chairman and treasurer of the commission, and director of local government. He appoints the staff of the commission and, subject to appropriations and concurrence of the state's director of personnel, fixes their compensation. In turn the staff members are by law responsible to him.

The unusually strong position accorded the state treasurer is largely to be explained by special circumstances revolving about Charles M. Johnson. The 1931 statute provided for a director of local government without other official connections. Mr. Johnson, who had had experience with local government finance as executive secretary of the County Government Advisory Commission, became the first director. Shortly thereafter he was appointed state treasurer. In order to keep the Local Government Commission from losing his services as director, the law was amended to provide that the state treasurer should be *ex officio* director of local government.

Criticism on the ground that this arrangement "imposes too much work and responsibility on one man"[7] appears to be unsound in view of the fact that the duties of the state treasurer are not particularly burdensome, and that most of the commission work not involving policy considerations can be delegated to subordinates. On the other hand, it should be made clear that the present organization of the commission should not be blindly followed by other states. Indeed, it is conceivable that North Carolina would change the *ex officio* directorship arrangement if another person should be elected state treasurer.

In practice, an assistant director of local government is the active

[6] North Carolina Public Laws, 1931, ch. 60. In the succeeding pages specific statutory citations will not be given. All relevant statutes are conveniently available in *Local Government Law Applicable to North Carolina Counties, Cities and Towns, 1939*, a pamphlet published by the Local Government Commission.

[7] B. U. Ratchford, "The Work of the North Carolina Local Government Commission," National Municipal Review, June 1936, p. 323

day-to-day head of the commission's staff, and also serves as secretary of the commission. W. E. Easterling, an able man trained in public accountancy, has held this post since establishment of the commission. Prior to that he had been assistant executive secretary of the County Government Advisory Commission.

The powers of the Local Government Commission are not so extensive as its name might suggest. All local governments, it is true, fall under its jurisdiction, be they counties, cities, towns, incorporated villages, school districts, or any other type of district or political subdivision. But the commission's powers relate exclusively to the *financial affairs* of local governments, and are of principal importance in connection with their debts.

Powers Not Used

A sound understanding of the commission's work requires that the statute's listing of powers should not be read as if it described what the commission actually does. With this, as with most governmental agencies, there are some powers that are fully used, some that are used cautiously, and still others that are dead letters in practice. The Local Government Commission has vast powers over local debt administration, but if it had used these powers fully, antagonized local officials, ignored public opinion, and, in general, neglected to temper the wind to the shorn lamb, the commission would not be in existence today.

In practice the most important powers of the commission have concerned the approval of bonds and tax-anticipation notes, the marketing of bonds and notes, and the negotiating of refinancing plans. All bonds and tax-anticipation notes proposed for issuance by local governments must be submitted to the commission for its approval. In deciding whether or not it will approve the issue, the commission must consider the necessity or expediency of the issue, the reasonableness of its amount, the adequacy of sinking funds, the burdensomeness of the tax rate that would be necessitated by the new issue, the status of the unit with regard to defaults, its compliance with budgetary control laws, and its tax collection record during the preceding fiscal year. If the commission believes that the proposed bond or note issue does not qualify under the statutory tests, it notifies the local unit, which may then demand a public hearing. If, after such a hearing, the commission still disapproves of the issue, it enters an order to that effect.

According to the statute, the local unit may take the question to the people in an election, but if it does not do so, or if a majority of those voting in the election do not favor the issue, the bonds or notes cannot be issued. It is notable that the commission's disapproval of bond issues has only once been overruled by popular vote in the local unit.

Even if the commission approves the issue, the state constitution requires that the question be submitted to the people of the unit for approval if the borrowing is for purposes that are not classified by the courts as "necessary expenses." And if the issue would make the total borrow-

ings during the fiscal year exceed two-thirds of the amount by which the outstanding indebtedness of the local unit was reduced during the preceding fiscal year, it must be submitted to the people even if it is for a "necessary expense." The only exceptions to this requirement of popular approval relate to funding or refunding existing debt, issuing tax-anticipation notes not exceeding 50 per cent of the taxes due during the fiscal year, supplying a casual deficit, suppressing riots or insurrections, and repelling invasions.[8]

The practical operation of this procedure has emphasized early discouragement of applications for approval of unsound bond and note issues rather than formal disapprovals of such applications by the commission. In reality a representative of a local government unit which desires to issue bonds or notes has a conference with a member of the Local Government Commission's staff. Practically all unsound proposals are killed at that stage.

Similarly, applications for a new issue of tax-anticipation notes might well be discouraged at the start if they are proposed by a town that has recently been embarrassed by its burden of such notes. The commission relies heavily on the recommendations of its assistant director so local units are naturally inclined to meet such objections as he may have to a proposed issue.

The assistant director thus occupies a key position in the process of approval of proposed bond and note issues. The executive committee, rather than the commission proper, takes most of the formal actions on approval of new issues. Although the fact that members of the executive committee are elective state officials might be expected to give a political flavor to this approval work, it appears that this has not been the case. For one thing, these state officials would scarcely be punished at the polls for their collective decisions as part of the Local Government Commission. For another, they protect themselves against political attacks by heavy reliance on the judgment of their assistant director.

[8]North Carolina State Constitution, art. V, sec. 4, and art. VII, sec. 7.

Appraisal of Work

There are no fixed standards for appraising the commission's work of approving bonds and notes. Statistics show a net reduction of the bonded indebtedness of local government of $56,000,000 between 1932 and 1940.[9] This is almost 15½ per cent of the 1932 debt. The pressure of depression demands for new and increased local services, the tempting offers of the federal government to partially subsidize locally sponsored construction projects, and the search for means of raising revenue other than by further taxes on property might well have led to a net increase of indebtedness had it not been for the commission's control over contraction of new debt by local governments. But there is no scientific way to discover whether or not this control was actually the determining

[9]North Carolina Local Government Commission, *Report*, 1940. The writer had access to a typescript of the report, which at the time of his investigation had not been printed.

factor in turning the trend in the other direction. Nor can we say whether or not the commission should have adopted a stronger policy that would have effected a still greater reduction in net indebtedness.

The phase of commission activity that has called forth the most unqualified praise arises out of the statutory provision that "all bonds and notes of a unit . . . shall be sold by the commission." This centralization of the task of marketing local government issues has greatly widened the market for local bonds and notes, secured substantially lower bids on the interest rates, and improved the technical handling of such sales. The assistant director of local government states justifiably: "The central marketing work in itself justifies the Local Government Commission's existence."

In practice one of the most important powers of the commission has been in connection with refinancing existing debts of local units. After any local unit has defaulted for a period of six months the director of local government can initiate investigations and conferences with local officials and creditors, and prepare a plan for refinancing or readjusting the debts involved. Once the commission has officially approved a plan that has been prepared or endorsed by its director, the governing body of the local unit is obligated to adopt it and to pass the necessary ordinances for carrying it into effect. Local governments that do operate under such plans may be required to submit their budgets to the director of local government for his approval.

The commission's policies on refinancing have undergone some alteration with the passage of time. Many of the early refinancing plans called for term bonds with sinking funds, rather than for serial bonds. This willingness to adopt a type of bond already responsible for some of the local units' difficulties can be explained by two considerations. In many cases it seemed to be almost impossible to persuade the holders of term bonds to exchange them for serial bonds. In the second place, the commission did not know how long the depression crisis would continue, and it feared that if term bonds of local units were converted into serial bonds the almost immediate obligation to meet principal as well as interest payments might drive many local units into default again within a few years.

All of the refinancing bonds, whether of a term or serial type, have carried the call feature that makes them redeemable prior to maturity. This has enabled the local units to call in many of their term bonds and convert them into serial bonds. It has also permitted them, with the commission's advice, to call in both term and serial bonds and put through refunding plans to take advantage of lower interest rates.

The commission has not used its powers over refinancing to force bondholders to accept a reduction of principal. The emphasis has been on the reduction of interest rates and the rearrangement of debt maturities so as to bring the annual debt service charges, particularly during the depression years, into reasonable relation to the units' abil-

ity to meet such charges. Of course, a few local governments, without formal refinancing plans, have been able to go into the market and buy in their own bonds below par—in some cases at rates as low as forty cents on the dollar.

Some Powers Not Used

The principal work of the Local Government Commission has revolved around the three functions already discussed. Several of the commission's other powers, as already stated, have been left practically unused. This is true, for example, of its power to appoint an administrator of finance for a local government and also of its power to prescribe uniform accounting systems for all local governments.

The statute authorizes the commission to take over administration of the financial affairs of any local government unit that defaults on the principal or interest payments due on any indebtedness. In case of such default the director of local government may appoint an administrator of finance for the local unit, and direct him to "take full charge of the collection of taxes . . . and the charge and custody of all funds . . . and the safeguarding thereof, and of the disbursement of moneys for all purposes." The administrator of finance has discretion to supervise and control or to remove any "officer having connection with the collection and disbursement of funds of the unit." All expenses of the commission and the administrator are to be charged to the local unit.

In addition to the permissive authority to appoint an administrator, the director of local government is charged with the mandatory duty of appointing such an administrator of finance, by and with the consent of the resident judge of the district in which the local unit is located, if, after one year has passed since the unit defaulted, the holders of 51 per cent of the indebtedness of the unit so petition.

In no instance has the commission appointed an administrator of finance. The commission's neglect of this power fits in with the basic philosophy motivating all of its work. This philosophy stresses the view that the commission exists to advise, help, and counsel local governments, to provide such central services as those for the refunding and marketing of bonds, and to discourage unwarranted increase of local government debts. These essential services would be undermined if the commission boldly went into defaulting units of government, took the handling of financial affairs out of the hands of local officials, and sent in an agent of the state to collect taxes from an enraged citizenry. The technique of persuasion, rather than that of coercion, is the only method that will work in the long run, thinks the commission.

Somewhat different considerations explain the failure of the commission to use its power to prescribe uniform accounting systems for local governments. The commission feels that uniform systems of accounting would be highly desirable, and that their installation remains a very real objective. But so far funds available for financing the commission's activi-

ties have not been sufficient to enable much progress along these lines.

The Local Government Commission has not fully used its power to force local units to dispose of the ineligible properties and securities in which part of their sinking funds are invested. In 1932 ineligible investments constituted 38 per cent of local government sinking fund assets, whereas by 1936 only 24 per cent and by 1941 only 15 per cent[10] of such assets were thus invested. Anyone familiar with the depression market for real estate and mortgages can appreciate that any attempt to force rapid liquidation of such investments held by local governments would have resulted in serious losses. Such losses, the commission thought, could be substantially reduced by a cautious policy of holding such assets until the market improved.

Broadly speaking, the commission has given satisfaction. Through its refinancing plans it has succeeded in reducing the number of local governments in default on their debt obligations. Nine counties and twenty-five towns are still in default, but for seven of these counties and six of the towns, refinancing plans are in process of negotiation.

Comparing the present number of defaulting units with the number of such units in 1933, the commission has been about 85 per cent effective in removing the stigma of default from the local governments of the state. This rough measure of effectiveness should be qualified by the observation that most of the towns still in default are of small size, and that if the negotiations now in progress for some of these units are consummated the percentage of effectiveness will be increased.

There is practically unanimous agreement that the commission has performed an invaluable service to local governments in effecting remarkable reductions in interest rates. Some of this reduction has been accomplished through skillful refinancing work, and some of it through the superior marketing facilities of the commission. Of course, the generally favorable market for local bonds during the depression accounts for part of the reduction, but the commission has shrewdly taken advantage of market conditions.

The prevention of unwise contraction of debt may be expected to assume greater relative importance as the emergency work of refinancing draws to completion. As we have seen, there is practically no yardstick available for evaluating the commission's activities in approving and disapproving applications for new bond and note issues. About all that can safely be said is that there is no general criticism of the commission's use of this power.

The commission has done much to rehabilitate local government credit in North Carolina, and in the future it should be able to prevent a recurrence of the chaotic conditions that characterized local finance in the early years of the depression. The general approval of the way in which the commission has used its powers assures the continuance of state control of local government debt in North Carolina.

[10] 1932 and 1936 figures computed from data in North Carolina Local Government Commission, *Report*, 1936, p. 12. The 1941 figure is a current estimate by W. E. Easterling, assistant director of local government.

Cleveland—Potential City of a Million

Mayor Blythin now organizing committee of private citizens to consider problems of 108 taxing units in city's metropolitan area.

By CHRISTIAN L. LARSEN
Western Reserve University

CLEVELAND was surprised and disappointed by the 1940 census returns. Its new population figure is 878,336—a decrease of 22,093 or 2.5 per cent since 1930, whereas a slight increase had been expected. Ten years ago, when Cleveland showed an increase of 13 per cent, it was taken for granted that the million mark would be exceeded by 1940, but that expectation had been modified somewhat before the bad news arrived.

Both the county and the metropolitan district of which Cleveland is a part showed slight population gains. Cuyahoga County's 1940 population of 1,217,250 represents a gain of 1.3 per cent, and the Cleveland metropolitan district, with boundaries as defined by the Census Bureau, can point to a gain of 1.7 per cent and a total population of 1,214,943.

Of interest in connection with population changes since 1930 is the fact that some of the larger suburbs immediately bordering upon Cleveland also suffered population losses. The second ring of municipalities has been the chief beneficiary of the population movement away from the center, three of these municipalities registering gains since 1930 of 167.4 per cent, 46.3 per cent, and 40.1 per cent respectively.

The taxpayers of Cuyahoga County are at present supporting 108 local taxing units: one county, fourteen cities, forty villages, six townships, thirty-two school districts, and fifteen library districts. For purposes of policing the 465 square miles within the county the taxpayers are supporting sixty-one police departments of various types, with annual expenditures ranging from about $50 to $4,000,000 (Cleveland), and per capita costs ranging as high as $30.25 ($4.79 in Cleveland). Similar unsatisfactory conditions exist as regards such matters as fire protection, planning, public works, and court systems. For the people of the area it means both government that is too expensive and services that are unsatisfactorily performed.

As early as 1913 Newton D. Baker contended that coördination of governmental activities in the Cleveland area should be sought. In 1917, in 1919, and in 1931 constitutional amendments were proposed in the state legislature which would have permitted counties of certain minimum populations to organize as municipal corporations and to provide unified services for the entire county, but all failed of legislative approval.

An encouraging development was

the adoption in 1933, by initiative and referendum, of a county home rule amendment to the state constitution.[1] One of its provisions authorizes municipalities and townships, with the consent of the county, to transfer any or all of their functions to the county, but municipalities and townships have not stampeded to avail themselves of this privilege.

County Home Rule

Another major provision authorizes counties to adopt home rule charters. Such charters may leave county and municipal functions undisturbed, or they may transfer municipal functions to the county. In the latter case, however, four separate majorities are required for the adoption of a proposed charter. A majority vote is required in: (1) the county as a whole, (2) the largest municipality in the county, (3) the total county area outside the largest municipality, (4) each of a majority of the total number of municipalities and townships in the county.

In accordance with the provisions of this amendment, the voters of Cuyahoga County in 1934 elected a commission to draft a charter for the county. While the commission tended to favor a transfer of municipal functions to the county it was believed that all four required majorities could not be obtained, so only a reorganization of the existing county government was sought. The resulting document placed all county administrative activities in six departments, and also provided for a county director or manager. In place of the board of county commissioners there was to be a county council of nine members, elected by proportional representation.

When the proposed charter was submitted to the electorate in 1935 it was approved by a majority vote in the county as a whole and by a majority vote in Cleveland. The third and fourth majorities were not obtained, but presumably they were not needed for a charter transferring no municipal functions to the county. In a surprising decision, however, the Ohio Supreme Court held that the county charter did provide for a transfer of municipal functions and that therefore it had not been adopted.[2]

This judicial decision was disheartening to the advocates of governmental coördination since it seemed to imply that any county home rule charter that might be proposed must receive all four majorities for adoption. Few believe that possible of achievement in the Cleveland area. A charter definitely assigning municipal functions to the county has been prepared by the Citizens League, primarily because of the educational value of such a project rather than with the expectation of submitting it to the electorate.

Apparently there is little possibility of securing the necessary approval for centering more activities in the county government. What hope, then, may there be of achieving governmental coördination in the Cleveland area by annexation? Apparently very little. There has been only one annexation to Cleveland since the 1930 census. Talk of an-

[1] Ohio Constitution, art. X.

[2] *The State, ex rel. Howland* v. *Krause et al., Board of Elections of Cuyahoga County,* 130 Ohio St. 455.

nexation immediately gives rise to claims on the part of public officials of Cleveland's suburbs that they provide better services and lower tax rates than Cleveland. Whatever the merit of such arguments, annexation does not appear probable in the immediate future.

Regional Association Organized

Realizing all this, a group of interested citizens in 1937 organized the Regional Association of Cleveland. This agency seeks to represent all elements of the Cleveland region, and is hopeful of achieving through unofficial coöperation some of the results hitherto sought through official action. Its major interest to date has been physical planning, feeling that such planning is essential for the solution of the various other regional problems.

Zoning has received considerable attention from the Cleveland Regional Association. All of the zoning maps and ordinances in the county have been collected, analyzed, and a report thereon sent to all municipal and county officials concerned. As a result, some of the existing ordinances have been revised and a few new ones have been drafted. A similar study and correlation of subdivision regulations is now under way.

A survey of land use in the county also has been made. Never before had there been a survey of all publicly owned land in the county. A card file of all publicly owned land and a map showing its location and ownership are now available. With the aid of WPA all tax delinquent property in the county has been mapped.

In the field of active collaboration the association has called conferences and organized coöperative committees. Two conferences of municipal and county officials concerned with planning have been held. The major purpose was to encourage thinking of planning problems as joint problems of the group. All have been supplied with a manual on local planning procedure, based upon Ohio statutes and prepared by the Regional Association. A public works committee of local planners and engineers has been organized for the purpose of developing a coördinated public works program for the region. Likewise, a smoke abatement committee has been created. Thus far only Cleveland has adopted the model smoke control ordinance drafted by the committee, and no money has been appropriated for its enforcement.

Two Regional Authorities

There are two regional authorities functioning in the Cleveland region, providing examples of what might be expected of regional government on a more extensive scale. The first of these is the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District, based upon a state law of 1916 authorizing park districts independent of existing political boundaries. It operates a system of recreation areas, arranged roughly in a semi-circle around the central built-up section of the region, and comprising more than 11,000 acres. The district is governed by a board of three members appointed by the judge of the local Probate Court. With the consent of the municipalities concerned, it may take over the administration of municipal parks.

It has its own separate tax levy, and it may go to the voters for an additional tax levy. Its popularity is demonstrated by an annual attendance at its various park areas of over 8,000,000, and by the fact that its special tax levy is the one tax levy which never has encountered difficulty in securing the necessary approval of the voters.

The second regional authority is the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority. It has been created by state law for the purpose of carrying on slum clearance and low-cost housing activities, and its authority extends over the entire county area with the exception of one municipality. Ohio state law, seeking to make the Housing Authority neither a municipal nor a county agency, provides that at least two subdivisions within the county must be included, and that the maximum subdivisions included shall be one less than the total number within the county. The governing body of this authority is a board of five unpaid citizens serving five-year overlapping terms. Two members are appointed by the Mayor of Cleveland, one is appointed by the Board of County Commissioners, one by the judge of the Probate Court, and one by the judges of the Common Pleas Court.

This second example of regional government also is considered highly successful. When projects now under construction are completed the Housing Authority will be operating 5,500 dwelling units for low income families and will have investments totaling $31,000,000. The question as to the level of administration is answered by the complete absence of suspicion in connection with the spending of the huge sums involved, and by the ability of the authority to negotiate loans from banks and private investors at very low rates.

It is encouraging to find some evidences of coördination in the activities of the various local governments of the Cleveland region. Such coordination plays a prominent part in making available an adequate supply of water to the population of the entire area. The Cleveland water plant serves a large majority of the municipalities, a considerable portion of the rural area of Cuyahoga County, and a few municipalities in a neighboring county. In 1940 the plant delivered 57,564,934,000 gallons of water for distribution, and served a population of 1,208,979. About one-fourth of the revenue-producing water is sold outside the corporate limits of Cleveland. In the case of four of the larger suburbs Cleveland sells the water to the municipalities, which in turn resell it to their inhabitants. For the remainder, Cleveland sells directly to the consumer. Only two other water plants are operating in Cuyahoga County.

Other Coordinated Activity

Nineteen municipalities are served in whole or in part by the Cleveland sewage treatment and disposal plants. Only three other municipalities in the county operate sewage disposal plants, and these also serve more than one municipality. In fact, two of these plants treat part of Cleveland's sewage, and the Cleveland system in turn treats a part of theirs. In addition, small plants are oper-

ated by some of the county sewer districts. The bulk of the sewage of the entire region, however, is handled by the Cleveland plants. At present an attempt is being made to secure the adoption of uniform rates for this service based upon water consumption.

Police departments of the region have been drawn into a closer relationship in recent years. The Cleveland department is willing to send radio messages for any police department equipped to receive such messages. Fifty-three departments are being served in this manner at a charge of twenty-five cents per message. In addition, the services of Cleveland's detective bureau and crime laboratory are available to all the suburbs at no cost, and members of the suburban departments may attend the Cleveland Police Academy. The latest development is the organizing of a metropolitan police safety committee to sponsor the uniform enforcement of traffic regulations throughout the larger suburbs and in Cleveland.

Cleveland's fire department has an unwritten understanding with each neighboring professional fire department to the effect that either will help the other in case of need and without charge. It will aid other areas if they are willing to pay for such service. At present an agreement to standardize hose couplings, hydrant connections, and the like is being sought as a means of making coöperative action more effective.

Examples of coördinated activity are offered by Cleveland's city hospital and by its various welfare and correctional institutions. These institutions accept cases from neighboring municipalities, from Cuyahoga County and neighboring counties, and from the state and federal governments on the basis of per diem rates determined by contract. Because of such arrangements some of these institutions are wholly self-supporting.

Some attempts are being made to break down artificial political boundaries in respect to parks. Three of Cleveland's parks are located in whole or in part in neighboring municipalities. Maintenance work is done by Cleveland, while the neighboring municipalities participate in the policing of the areas. In another instance land owned by Cleveland within the boundaries of a neighboring municipality has been leased to that municipality for park purposes. The Joint Park Planning Committee, made up of representatives of the Metropolitan Park District already discussed, the city of Cleveland, and private citizens, is seeking a closer tie between the metropolitan and the Cleveland park systems. A report discussing in general terms what ought to be done has been made, but concrete results have been few.

Citizen Committee

Recognizing that such coöperative ventures as are being carried on at present are far from adequate, Mayor Edward Blythin of Cleveland is now organizing a committee of private citizens to consider the problem as a whole. Three citizens are being appointed from each of fourteen municipalities near the center of the built-up area, and the committee will be asked to make suggestions for a

common attack on the problems concerning all.

It is felt that hitherto the consideration of these problems has been left too much to public officials, who may be personally interested in having present arrangements continue unchanged. Perhaps private citizens will recognize more readily that the central city is more important to the suburbs than are the suburbs to the central city; that when the central city spends millions on arterial streets leading to the suburbs it increases its own financial burden but reduces property values by making it easier for people to get out to the suburbs. Perhaps also they may see the fairness of assuming a part of the burden of a public auditorium and a municipal stadium, which are financial white elephants, but which make grand opera and other attractions available to the entire region. Similar reasoning applies to the cost of fights waged by the central city for lower public utility rates, which, if granted, extend also to neighboring jurisdictions.

If this committee assumes active leadership in a campaign to educate the people to think in terms of regionalism, much will have been accomplished. Such thinking is particularly important at this time, since Cleveland is now considering municipal ownership and operation of a mass transportation system, either through purchase of the existing system or by creation of a competing system. As such a system would serve various neighboring municipalities, its problems should be of concern to all.

Public education in regionalism might also lead to an improved county government. Cuyahoga County, as is true of all Ohio counties, operates under the typical headless, unintegrated county governmental structure. Since 1933 the state legislature has been authorized by constitutional provision to prepare alternative forms of governmental organization from which those counties dissatisfied with their present organization might choose, but this has not been done. In fact, a bill to this effect introduced in the present session of the state legislature apparently will not even be assigned to a committee for consideration. Even though the bill does not require counties to change their governmental structure at all, strong opposition has developed. The suburbs fear it as a first step leading to annexation, the county political organizations are opposed because the alternative forms of organization tend to favor appointive department heads, and Ohio's rural legislators feel that they must oppose anything in which the larger population centers might be interested.

Present Situation

There are bright spots in the governmental picture as we find it in the Cleveland metropolitan region, but the situation as a whole is far from satisfactory. The two regional authorities we now have are being remarkably successful in attacking housing and rural parks, but a separate unit of government for each major function hardly seems to offer a satisfactory solution. There are no indications of existing governmental

(Continued on Page 364)

The Bonded Debt of 304 Cities as at January 1, 1941

Downward trend in municipal debt has increased with gathering force since 1935 — in contrast to increase in federal debt over same period.

By ROSINA MOHAUPT
Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc.

FOR every man, woman, and child living in cities of over 30,000 population there is outstanding $175 of municipal debt. This average debt is based on an estimated total gross bonded debt of $8,927,000,000 for the 343 American cities over 30,000 population, representing 50,931,338 or 39 per cent of the entire population of the country.

The downward trend in per capita debt first noticed in 1935 has continued with gathering force since that time. The per capita decrease in gross debt of $3.78 and in net debt (excluding utilities)[1] of $3.05 for the 235 American cities over 30,000 population reporting in 1940 and 1941 is the largest drop since the first annual tabulation in 1923.

While cities of all sizes showed decreases in both gross and net per capita debt during the past year, the largest drop was reported by cities over 500,000, where a decrease of $5.13 per capita in gross debt and $4.18 per capita in net debt (less utilities) occurred. Cities over 300,000 have been reporting the greatest per capita decreases in debt for each of the past five years.

Continued decrease in the debt of the larger American cities is in sharp contrast with the marked increase in federal debt and is a major phenomenon in governmental financing. Debt limitations based on assessed values have prohibited some municipalities from issuing additional bonds because of shrinkages in realty values. The gradual shifting of responsibilities from the local to the federal sphere, and new concepts of social welfare, are partially responsible for this trend.

The decrease in the rate of growth of the larger cities apparently has far-reaching political consequences. The gradual drop in school population has eliminated, to a considerable extent, the need for extensive school building programs. The determination of the particular factors involved would require a study of each individual city, but the continued trend is so pronounced as to suggest the operation of common underlying forces.

While debt has been consistently on the down grade for the past five or six years except for cities under 100,000, the increases reported during the first five years of the past decade have not yet been offset, inasmuch as the total gross debt is still 7.8 per cent and the net debt (excluding utilities), 5.1 per cent higher than in

[1]Net debt less utilities is obtained by deducting sinking funds and *all* public utility debt, whether self-supporting or not, from the gross bonded debt. It is the most significant figure in studying the debt structure of cities since it represents the burden carried by the general property taxpayer.

1930. In analyzing the change in debt figures between 1930 and 1941, cities were divided into two main groups—those which grew and those which decreased in population as reported by the 1930 and the 1940 United States Census figures.

The cities which decreased in population during this period follow two distinct patterns. Those between 100,000 and 500,000 population show a pronounced tendency toward a greater increase in net debt (excluding utilities) than cities which have grown in population. Closer scrutiny of these cities shows that the major part of the increase was for purely governmental purposes rather than for public utility enterprises.

On the other hand, smaller cities (under 50,000 population) with decreasing populations in the past ten years have reduced their debt considerably more than growing cities of the same size.

Growing cities as a group have devoted a major portion of their increases in debt to new or enlarged public utility facilities. This is indicated by the fact that the rate of increase in both gross and net debt is greater than that of net debt excluding utilities.

The size and character of New York City is so different from that of other large cities (group I[2]) that changes in its outstanding debt more than counteract changes in all the other cities in the group combined. For this reason the debt of New York City is deducted from the totals and the figures for remaining cities in group I are shown separately. A large increase in the public utility (subway) debt of New York City accounts for the $14.40 increase in gross debt.

Substantial decreases in per capita debt show up in all five population groups. While 20 per cent of the cities did increase their outstanding debt, the great majority of cities reported decreases in both gross and net debt.

Methods of Tabulation

The figures reported in this tabulation represent municipal debt exclusively except as indicated in the footnotes. In some cases functions which are commonly administered by the city are under an ad hoc authority such as the school district. Wherever this is the case, such debt is added to

[2]For the upper and lower limits of the five population groups, see the general tabulation.

TABLE I

TOTAL GROSS AND NET BONDED DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1940-41
235 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES (IN MILLION DOLLARS)

Population Group[a]	*No. of Cities*	*Gross Bonded Debt*		*Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities*	
		1941	*1940*	*1941*	*1940*
I	13	$5,549.1	$5,236.4	$2,412.0	$2,450.4
I[b]	12	2,512.9	2,586.0	1,459.8	1,519.4
II	15	872.2	890.3	589.3	603.9
III	58	1,127.3	1,160.2	741.3	761.5
IV	73	541.0	547.1	386.2	398.5
V	76	249.5	259.7	185.5	192.1
Total	235	8,339.1	8,093.8	4,314.3	4,406.4
Total[b]	234	5,303.0	5,443.4	3,362.1	3,475.4

[a]For the upper and lower limits of each population group, see general tabulation.
[b]Excluding New York City.

TABLE II

PER CAPITA GROSS AND NET DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1940-41
235 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES

Population Group[a]	1940 Population (000 omitted)	Gross Bonded Debt 1941[d]	Gross Bonded Debt 1940[d]	Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities 1941[d]	Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities 1940[d]
I	21,705	$255.66	$241.26	$111.64	$112.90
I[b]	14,250	176.35	181.48	102.45	106.63
II	5,593[c]	155.95	159.19	105.38	107.99
III	9,224	122.22	125.78	80.37	82.56
IV	5,053	107.08	108.29	76.43	78.87
V	3,072	81.23	84.55	60.38	62.52
Total	44,645	186.79	181.29	96.64	98.70
Total[b]	37,190	142.59	146.37	90.40	93.45

TABLE III

CHANGE IN PER CAPITA DEBT—TWO-YEAR COMPARISON

Population Group[a]	Gross Bonded Debt 1940-41 Increase	Gross Bonded Debt 1940-41 Decrease	Gross Bonded Debt 1939-40 Increase	Gross Bonded Debt 1939-40 Decrease	Net Debt Less Utilities 1940-41 Increase	Net Debt Less Utilities 1940-41 Decrease	Net Debt Less Utilities 1939-40 Increase	Net Debt Less Utilities 1939-40 Decrease
I	$14.40		$5.10			$1.26	$ .53	
I[b]		$5.13		$3.39		4.18		$3.17
II[c]		3.24	1.11			2.61	.99	
III		3.56	1.01			2.19		1.85
IV		1.21		1.15		2.44		2.35
V		3.32		1.84		2.14		.72
Total	5.50		2.56			2.06		.38
Total[b]		3.78		1.01		3.05		2.00

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF CITIES REPORTING DEBT CHANGES—1940-41

Population Group[a]	Gross Bonded Debt: Growing Cities[e] Increase	Gross Bonded Debt: Growing Cities[e] Decrease	Gross Bonded Debt: Declining Cities[f] Increase	Gross Bonded Debt: Declining Cities[f] Decrease	Net Debt Less Utilities: Growing Cities[e] Increase	Net Debt Less Utilities: Growing Cities[e] Decrease	Net Debt Less Utilities: Declining Cities[f] Increase	Net Debt Less Utilities: Declining Cities[f] Decrease
I	2	7		4	2	7	1	3
II[c]	2	9	1	3	3	8	1	3
III	10	30	2	16	8	32	3	15
IV	12	38	6	17	11	39	5	18
V	7	44	1	24	6	45	4	21
Total	33	128	10	64	30	131	14	60

[a]For the upper and lower limits of each population group, see general tabulation.
[b]Excluding New York City.
[c]Excluding Washington, D. C., which has no debt.
[d]Computed on the basis of the 1940 U. S. Census.
[e]Cities which have increased in population between 1930 and 1940.
[f]Cities which have decreased in population between 1930 and 1940.

TABLE V

RANGE OF PER CAPITA NET DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1941
THREE HIGHEST AND THREE LOWEST IN EACH GROUP

Population Group[a]	*Three Highest Cities*	*Per Capita Net Debt Less Utilities*	*Three Lowest Cities*	*Per Capita Net Debt Less Utilities*
I	Buffalo, N. Y.	$153.79	Milwaukee, Wis.	$47.00
	Philadelphia, Pa.	146.21	Los Angeles, Calif.	64.75
	Detroit, Mich.	145.05	San Francisco, Calif.	70.04
II	Newark, N. J.	178.43	Atlanta, Ga.	31.62
	Jersey City, N. J.	170.01	Oakland, Calif.	56.60
	Rochester, N. Y.	154.88	Portland, Ore.	59.40
III	Miami, Fla.	209.88	Fort Wayne, Ind.	20.28
	Camden, N. J.	203.26	Spokane, Wash.	21.06
	Yonkers, N. Y.	197.31	Tacoma, Wash.	24.69
IV	Atlantic City, N. J.	361.27	Saginaw, Mich.	8.21
	St. Petersburg, Fla.	352.71	Lansing, Mich.	8.56
	Asheville, N. C.	346.03	Holyoke, Mass.	13.66
V	West Palm Beach, Fla.	361.15	Fargo, N. D.	2.76
	White Plains, N. Y.	267.18	Arlington, Mass.	9.86
	Perth Amboy, N. J.	223.29	Danville, Ill.	12.50

TABLE VI

TOTAL GROSS AND NET BONDED DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1930-1940-1941
168 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES (IN MILLION DOLLARS)

Population Group[a]	*No. of Cities*	*Gross Bonded Debt*			*Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities*		
		1941	*1940*	1930	*1941*	*1940*	*1930*
I[b]	11	$1,921.0	$1,972.6	$1,689.5	$1,177.4	$1,221.9	$1,114.5
II[c]	13	756.4	775.2	722.5	533.3	545.0	452.2
III	50	996.7	1,031.5	948.7	669.3	686.7	658.6
IV	48	353.9	360.1	346.5	254.0	264.1	261.7
V	46	139.4	146.6	157.4	104.3	110.5	119.1
Total[b]	168	4,167.3	4,285.9	3,864.6	2,738.3	2,828.2	2,606.1

TABLE VII

PER CAPITA GROSS AND NET BONDED DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1930-40-41
168 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES

Population Group[a]	*No. of Cities*	*Gross Bonded Debt*			*Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities*		
		1941[d]	*1940*[d]	*1930*[e]	*1941*[d]	*1940*[d]	*1930*[e]
I[b]	11	$155.94	$160.13	$141.41	$ 95.58	$ 99.19	$93.29
II[c]	13	156.28	160.16	154.25	110.19	112.61	96.55
III	50	122.81	127.09	122.03	82.46	84.61	84.71
IV	48	102.99	104.78	104.39	73.91	76.86	78.98
V	46	72.88	76.68	83.00	54.54	57.76	62.78
Total[b]	168	136.09	139.96	130.50	89.42	92.35	88.00

[a]For the upper and lower limits of each population group, see general tabulation.
[b]Excluding New York City.
[c]Excluding Washington, D. C., which has no debt.
[d]Computed on basis of 1940 U. S. Census.
[e]Computed on basis of 1930 U. S. Census.

the debt reported by the municipality. In a few cases, where there is a combined city-county plan of government in effect, the city debt reflects the county debt burden. Footnotes for these cities explain the situation. No attempt is made to include the overlapping debt in cities not under the city-county plan. Although the combined city-county municipalities may appear at some disadvantage, this is somewhat counteracted by the fact that such cities are in a better position to control the expenditures and activities of the county. Many counties have a tendency to become liberal with funds that have come largely from the taxpayers of the one or two large municipalities within their borders, and have incurred obligations which have added greatly to the citizens' tax bill.

Special assessment debt, except where specified by footnote, is not included in the total or per capita debt figures. The amount of such debt and the percentage which is a general obligation of the city is shown in the last two columns of the tabulation.

In the first sixteen annual tabulations made by the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, the net debt excluding self-supporting utilities was reported. Because of varying concepts of the definition of the term "self-supporting," however, it seemed expedient to compute net debt excluding *all* utilities whether self-supporting or not. This change was initiated in the 1939 tabulation and has been in effect since then. In making comparisons with figures of previous years all necessary adjustments have been made.

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE IN DEBT OVER TEN-YEAR PERIOD

		Cities Increasing in Population			*Cities Decreasing in Population*			*All Cities Reporting in 1930, 1940, & 1941*		
Population Group[a]	*Years Compared*	*No. of Cities*	*Gross Debt %*	*Net Debt excl. Util. %*	*No. of Cities*	*Gross Debt %*	*Net Debt excl. Util. %*	*No. of Cities*	*Gross Debt %*	*Net Debt excl. Util. %*
I[b]	1930-41	8	+16.3	+ 5.4	3	+ 4.1	+ 6.6	11	+13.7	+ 5.6
	1930-40	8	+19.5	+10.0	3	+ 6.6	+ 7.8	11	+16.8	+ 9.6
II	1930-41	9	— 3.2	+ 3.8	4	+18.8	+45.1	13	+ 4.7	+17.9
	1930-40	9	— 1.4	+ 4.2	4	+22.8	+51.9	13	+ 7.3	+20.5
III	1930-41	34	+ 6.7	— 1.2	16	+ .7	+ 8.0	50	+ 5.1	+ 1.6
	1930-40	34	+ 9.5	+ 1.0	16	+ 6.7	+11.8	50	+ 8.7	+ 4.3
IV	1930-41	30	+11.1	— 3.3	18	— 9.6	— 2.5	48	+ 2.1	— 2.9
	1930-40	30	+13.6	+ 1.6	18	— 8.8	+ 0.03	48	+ 3.9	+ .9
V	1930-41	26	— 8.5	— 3.9	20	—15.2	—21.3	46	—11.5	—12.4
	1930-40	26	— 3.6	+ 2.0	20	—10.9	—16.9	46	— 6.8	— 7.2
Total[b]	1930-41	107	+ 9.5	+ 2.5	61	+ 3.7	+11.5	168	+ 7.8	+ 5.1
	1930-40	107	+12.0	+ 5.9	61	+ 7.2	+15.1	168	+10.9	+ 8.5

[a]For the upper and lower limits of each population group, see general tabulation.
[b]Excluding New York City.

This change in method of reporting has made necessary a definition of the term "utility." For the purposes of this tabulation a utility has now been defined as a commercial enterprise operated by a unit of government, entirely outside the scope of the purely governmental functions, serving the city as a whole rather than any small group and earning a portion or all of its overhead, operating and debt charges from revenues based on a rate structure. Water, light and power, gas, street railway, rapid transit, port and harbor facilities, docks and sewage disposal plants are covered by this definition.

Numerous self-supporting activities of municipalities are sometimes classified as utilities. Among these are included such facilities as golf courses, swimming pools, stadiums, convention halls, airports, etc., which for the purposes of this tabulation have been considered as public service enterprises and have been included with general city debt.

While three hundred and four cities furnished debt figures for this study, the summary tables are based on only the American cities reporting in all of the years being compared. Two hundred and thirty-five cities reported in both 1940 and 1941, and one hundred and sixty-eight in 1930, 1940, and 1941.

The Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research wishes to acknowledge the coöperation of public officials, research bureaus, chambers of commerce, and other civic agencies which have made possible these tabulations throughout the past nineteen years.

EDITORIAL

(Continued from Page 320)

published in this issue of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW it is especially interesting to note that cities between 100,000 and 500,000 which are shrinking show a greater tendency toward increase of debt than do comparable cities which are growing. This, in general, must be taken to indicate an unwillingness to face the facts and to pare operating costs down to diminishing tax income. In other words, these shrinking cities apparently are borrowing for running expenses.

Miss Mohaupt's study shows a general downward trend in the debt of cities but there is a question as to how real the relief is when we consider the taxpayer himself instead of the city in which he lives. Increasing federal debt and the growing tendency to shift formerly local responsibilities to federal or regional authorities will indicate, in many cases, a mere transfer of debt rather than a genuine improvement. For example, another study[1] shows that "the most striking debt change was the expansion of special district gross debt by 57 per cent."

If those in whose hands rests the financial planning of their cities will look back at the hectic period through which municipal finance went after the last war, they will make haste now to put their houses in order by facing responsibility rather than by shifting it. We don't know just what it will be like, but another post-war period is coming.

[1] *State and Local Government Debt: 1940.* Prepared under the supervision of C. E. Rightor, Chief Statistician for State and Local Government. Washington, D. C., Bureau of the Census, April 1941. See also discussion of this study on page 382 of this issue.

BONDED DEBT OF 304 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1941
Compiled by the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc.
From Data Furnished by Members of the Governmental Research Association, City Officials, and Chambers of Commerce

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT: General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	SINKING FUNDS: Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	NET BONDED DEBT: Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS: Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
	Group I														
	Population 500,000 and over		$	$	$	$					$	$	$	$	
1(1)†	New York, N. Y.[1]	7,454,995	823,176,022	353,690,473	1,859,246,091	3,036,112,586	520,228,981	—	—	57	2,515,883,605	952,206,783	127.73	194,504,750	100
2(2)	Chicago, Ill.[2]	3,396,808	267,984,624	35,749,000	2,620,000	306,353,624	16,756,627	43	57	N	289,596,997	286,976,997	84.48	15,996,201	—
3(3)	Philadelphia, Pa.[3]	1,931,334	329,362,701	74,510,000	188,106,899*	591,979,600	176,205,790	53	16	31	415,773,810	282,386,911	146.21	N	0
4(4)	Detroit, Mich.[4]	1,623,452	173,186,976	65,781,682	121,609,739	360,578,397	23,595,048	15	N	85	336,983,349	235,488,318	145.05	665,500	100
5(5)	Los Angeles, Cal.[5]	1,504,277	47,292,869	50,110,267	227,241,827	324,644,963	960,714	N	N	100	323,684,249	97,403,136	64.75	6,030,614	0
6(6)	Cleveland, Ohio[6]	878,336	90,567,280	8,193,875	23,690,000	122,451,155	8,267,061	60	N	40	114,184,094	93,768,264	106.76	1,667,756	100
7(8)	Baltimore, Md.	859,100	103,930,156	20,001,712	52,990,212	176,922,080	30,652,017	78	4	18	146,270,063	98,897,979	115.12	—	—
8(7)	St. Louis, Mo.[7]	816,048	64,823,000	1,892,000	5,520,000	72,235,000	3,371,074	77	10	13	68,863,926	63,794,926	78.18	N	0
9(9)	Boston, Mass.[8]	770,816	67,138,900	7,463,000	107,072,000	181,673,900	23,450,444	20	12	68	158,223,456	67,083,318	87.03	—	—
10(10)	Pittsburgh, Pa.	671,659	59,186,000	20,896,719	4,125,700	84,208,419	7,071,228	67	28	5	77,137,191	73,399,651	109.28	N	0
11(14)	Washington, D. C.	663,091	No Bonded Debt												
12(11)	San Francisco, Cal.[9]	634,536	32,853,400	11,590,000	100,088,000	144,531,400	N	N	N	N	144,531,400	44,443,400	70.04	830,000	0
13(12)	Milwaukee, Wis.[10]	587,472	34,867,951	4,126,500	2,618,000	41,612,451	11,383,625	95	5	N	30,228,826	27,614,826	47.00	N	0
14(13)	Buffalo, N. Y.[11]	575,901	78,643,733	11,390,500	15,720,775	105,755,008	5,805,897	25	N	75	99,949,111	88,565,382	153.79	100,275	100
	Group II														
	Poulation 300,000 to 500,000														
15(16)	New Orleans, La.[12]	494,537	65,334,000	6,972,000	7,807,000	80,113,000	300,023	N	100	N	79,812,977	72,005,977	145.60	3,128,020	0

*=Estimated.
N=None.
—=Figures not available.

†Cities are arranged according to 1940 census figures. Numbers in parentheses show order in which cities were listed in previous tabulations in accordance with 1930 census figures. Where there is no number in parentheses, the city had a population of less than 30,000 in the 1930 decennial census.

[1]**New York City.** General debt includes $178,420,000 assessment and $16,084,750 special assessment bonds. Of the utility debt $951,441,988 is self-supporting.

[2]**Chicago.** General debt includes $89,525,700 park district and $93,720,924 santitary district debt (city's pro-rata share). County debt of $31,776,410 and forest preserve debt of $13,124,750 not included (81.55% of total debt of these units).

[3]**Philadelphia.** Self-supporting utility debt estimated at $65,000,000.

[4]**Detroit.** Housing Commission bond anticipation notes of $9,600,000 and Street Railway equipment trust notes of $1,040,000 not included.

[5]**Los Angeles.** General debt includes $15,209,144 flood control and utility includes $125,739,327 metropolitan water district debt (city's pro-rata share). Harbor debt ($15,652,000) is only 35% self-supporting.

[6]**Cleveland.** Utility debt includes $2,682,000 light debt serviced by taxation because of inability of city to pay former street lighting bills. Special assessment debt of $1,667,756 and sinking fund overdraft of $4,189,773 included in general debt and sinking fund.

[7]**St. Louis.** Although only city debt is tabulated for most cities, the St. Louis debt includes all local overlapping debt inasmuch as certain functions, elsewhere performed by the county or special districts, are performed by the city. Relief bonds of $2,875,000 are actually serviced by municipal bridge tolls but are also general obligations of the city.

[8]**Boston.** Utility debt includes city's pro-rata share of Boston Metropolitan District debt ($30,472,300) which is a general obligation of the district but is serviced from revenues.

[9]**San Francisco.** Does not include $26,775,000 city's share of Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District debt. General city debt includes $2,280,000, airport bonds not self-supporting; $15,392,000 of water debt is not self-supporting.

[10]**Milwaukee.** General city debt includes $8,369,619 city's share of relief bonds issued by county and $11,926,332 city's share of Metropolitan Sewage District debt.

[11]**Buffalo.** Does not include $3,225,000 tax anticipation notes.

[12]**New Orleans.** General debt includes $21,175,000 Orleans Levee District debt. Utility debt includes $3,500,000 Public Belt Railroad Bridge bonds. Port bonds of approximately $35,000,000 not included.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
16(15)	Minneapolis, Minn.[13]	492,370	48,844,030	14,208,424	12,093,000	75,145,454	2,510,178	54	29	17	72,635,276	60,979,355	123.85	3,684,444	100
17(17)	Cincinnati, Ohio[14]	455,610	42,031,516	10,950,500	33,502,039	86,484,055	25,541,104	35	10	55	60,942,951	41,568,220	91.24	1,663,675	100
18(18)	Newark, N. J.[15]	429,760	76,307,752	17,148,200	20,164,000	113,619,952	19,935,357	51	33	16	93,684,595	76,683,007	178.43	—	—
19(19)	Kansas City, Mo.[16]	399,178	32,609,000	19,878,000	14,221,000	66,708,000	6,419,966	N	100	N	60,288,034	46,067,748	115.41	—	0
20(21)	Indianapolis, Ind.[17]	386,972	18,610,227	7,941,000	7,717,000	34,268,227	1,107,233	79	13	8	33,160,994	25,532,661	65.98	1,249,234	—
21(26)	Houston, Tex.[18]	384,514	29,354,250	10,067,250	1,110,000	40,531,500	6,078,987	69	23	8	34,452,513	33,850,190	88.03	N	0
22(20)	Seattle, Wash.	368,302	15,250,000	7,045,000	52,968,000	75,263,000	257,559	N	48	52	75,005,441	22,171,925	60.20	17,273,833	0
23(22)	Rochester, N. Y.[19]	324,975	42,248,000	12,797,500	5,106,000	60,151,500	6,507,785	55	17	28	53,643,715	50,331,986	154.88	3,838,000	100
24(29)	Denver, Colo.[20]	322,412	16,013,160	5,816,000	24,753,600	46,582,760	1,343,441	16	N	84	45,239,319	21,611,140	67.03	3,239,600	14
25(24)	Louisville, Ky.[21]	319,077	30,967,400	10,966,400	1,000,000	42,933,800	9,019,730	—	—	9	33,914,070	33,722,255	105.69	N	0
26(28)	Columbus, Ohio[22]	306,087	24,303,266	6,030,082	4,113,000	34,446,348	5,839,026	41	35	24	28,607,322	25,897,867	84.61	2,727,166	100
27(25)	Portland, Ore.[23]	305,394	17,311,072	4,463,910	13,747,000	35,521,982	5,769,024	62	N	38	29,752,958	18,140,595	59.40	2,344,608	100
28(32)	Atlanta, Ga.	302,288	6,932,500	3,695,500	1,700,000	12,328,000	1,186,395	66	24	10	11,141,605	9,559,214	31.62	552,000	100
29(30)	Oakland, Calif.[24]	302,163	8,451,160	8,652,000	31,716,653	48,819,813	N	N	N	N	48,819,813	17,103,160	56.60	264,027	100
30(23)	Jersey City, N. J.[25]	301,173	43,642,500	11,130,000	13,314,255	68,086,755	7,444,085	27	21	52	60,642,670	51,203,743	170.01	N	0
	Group III Population 100,000 to 300,000														
31(33)	Dallas, Tex.	294,734	19,312,500	7,095,750	10,547,000	36,955,250	2,938,557	52	12	36	34,016,693	24,534,537	83.24	N	0
32(36)	Memphis, Tenn.	292,942	15,548,000	5,260,000	25,298,000	46,106,000	2,710,036	54	19	27	43,395,964	18,834,901	64.30	304,000	100
33(31)	St. Paul, Minn.[26]	287,736	19,546,000	9,277,000	6,466,000	35,289,000	6,703,368	—	—	24	28,585,632	23,757,121	82.57	6,000,000	—
34(27)	Toledo, Ohio[27]	282,349	25,363,473	13,091,285	4,382,000	42,836,758	2,569,914	57	43	N	40,266,844	35,884,844	127.09	710,372	100
35(34)	Birmingham, Ala.[28]	267,583	12,742,000	9,559,000	4,000,000	26,301,000	3,743,769	100	N	N	22,557,231	18,557,231	69.35	—	100
36(38)	San Antonio, Tex.[29]	253,854	14,227,000	6,288,000	5,851,000	26,366,000	782,019	49	25	26	25,583,981	19,935,249	78.53	N	0
37(37)	Providence, R. I.[30]	253,504	32,493,000	15,572,000	18,000,000	66,065,000	17,020,829	44	20	36	49,044,171	37,182,112	146.67	N	0
38(35)	Akron, Ohio	244,791	24,187,518	4,773,995	8,635,000	37,596,513	2,833,774	18	12	70	34,762,739	28,104,327	114.81	1,146,300	100
39(39)	Omaha, Neb.	223,844	7,289,650	8,076,250	3,808,000	19,173,900	6,155,162	16	39	45	13,018,738	11,983,738	53.54	3,997,850	0
40(41)	Dayton, Ohio	210,718	8,476,370	4,979,159	3,025,000	16,480,529	1,990,442	83	N	17	14,490,087	11,806,804	56.03	606,543	—

[13]**Minneapolis.** General debt includes $266,000 market bonds and utility debt includes $6,451,000 sewage disposal bonds partially self-supporting.

[14]**Cincinnati.** General city debt includes $510,500 non-self-supporting airport bonds. Rental of Cincinnati Southern Railway is sufficient to provide debt service on additional $14,000,000 debt.

[15]**Newark.** General debt includes refunded subway, airport, port and dock bonds which are financed by taxation.

[16]**Kansas City.** General debt includes $750,000 Missouri River Bridge bonds in litigation which may be taken over by the state. Utility debt of $9,000,000 is general city obligation but is serviced from revenues.

[17]**Indianapolis.** General debt includes city's share of five poor relief districts within the city.

[18]**Houston.** General debt includes $715,000 convention hall bonds payable from revenues and $2,056,000 water bonds, payable from taxation.

[19]**Rochester.** General debt includes $2,900,000 tax revenue and $3,838,000 special assessment debt.

[20]**Denver.** General debt includes $8,168,160 Moffat Tunnel District debt (city's share) financed through taxation.

[21]**Louisville.** School sinking fund included in city. Utility debt is not an obligation of the city.

[22]**Columbus.** General debt includes $2,727,166 special assessment bonds with sinking fund shortage of $1,158,877.

[23]**Portland.** General debt includes city's share of Port of Portland debt.

[24]**Oakland.** General debt includes $6,642,547 tax-supported harbor bonds. Utility debt is city's share of East Bay Municipal Utility District debt.

[25]**Jersey City.** Debt as of February 28, 1941.

[26]**St. Paul, et al.** City sinking fund includes school.

[27]**Toledo.** Library debt of $1,050,000 included in debt of school district which is independent of the city.

[28]**Birmingham.** Debt as of February 1, 1941.

[29]**San Antonio.** Debt as of March 1, 1941.

[30]**Providence.** General debt includes $1,190,000 harbor debt.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
41(40)	Syracuse, N. Y.[31]	205,967	23,370,425	4,820,431	4,762,625	32,953,481	N	N	N	N	32,953,481	28,190,856	136.87	144,000	100
42(43)	Oklahoma City, Okla.	204,424	7,291,500	4,729,023	3,758,000	15,778,523	5,524,116	32	24	44	10,254,407	9,925,207	48.55	1,656,393	0
43(53)	San Diego, Calif.[32]	203,341	2,442,281	3,234,500	11,952,184	17,628,965	N	N	N	N	17,628,965	5,676,781	27.92	2,041,709	0
44(42)	Worcester, Mass.	193,694	10,136,000	N	2,098,700	12,234,700	N	N	N	N	12,234,700	10,136,000	52.33	1,270,000	100
45(44)	Richmond, Va.[33]	193,042	24,515,264	6,939,895	7,663,941	39,119,100	14,108,276	59	18	23	25,010,824	20,588,463	106.65	N	0
46	Honolulu, Hawaii[34]	179,358	14,655,059	—	6,579,947	21,235,006	4,655,465	—	—	37	16,579,541	11,738,330	45.45	356,303	100
47(48)	Fort Worth, Tex.	177,662	12,783,000	6,221,500	7,187,000	26,191,500	1,402,447	36	64	N	24,789,053	17,602,053	99.08	N	0
48(63)	Jacksonville, Fla.[35]	173,065	8,271,000	3,526,000	4,740,000	16,537,000	1,586,529	54	37	9	14,950,471	10,360,596	59.87	707,000	100
49(78)	Miami, Fla.[36]	172,172	30,438,997	5,697,000	1,323,000	37,458,997	N	N	—	N	37,458,997	36,135,997	209.88	—	—
50(45)	Youngstown, Ohio[37]	167,720	9,465,555	1,531,000	590,500	11,587,055	1,222,943	—	23	—	10,364,112	9,773,612	58.27	187,000	100
51(51)	Nashville, Tenn.	167,402	8,738,000	3,544,000	17,936,000	30,218,000	1,302,936	—	—	—	28,915,064	10,979,064	65.59	—	—
52(47)	Hartford, Conn.[38]	166,267	18,389,000	4,887,000	2,025,000	25,301,000	3,315,675	59	30	11	21,985,325	20,308,690	122.15	N	0
53(46)	Grand Rapids, Mich.	164,292	5,025,200	1,309,846	4,955,000	11,290,046	1,915,000	21	N	79	9,375,046	5,931,046	36.10	1,068,000	100
54(57)	Long Beach, Calif.[39]	164,271	5,269,274	6,641,137	27,619,856	39,530,267	N	N	N	N	39,530,267	11,910,411	72.50	—	0
55(49)	New Haven, Conn.	160,605	12,581,000	284,000	N	12,865,000	734,563	90	10	N	12,130,437	12,130,437	75.53	N	0
56(56)	Des Moines, Iowa	159,819	5,694,493	6,525,500	4,019,000	16,238,993	383,228	N	N	100	15,855,765	12,219,993	76.46	—	—
57(50)	Flint, Mich.	151,543	5,295,729	4,256,000	1,649,100	11,200,829	2,795,015	28	33	39	8,405,814	7,837,504	51.72	678,000	100
58(59)	Salt Lake City, Utah[32]	149,934	2,731,000	3,761,000	4,127,000	10,619,000	659,093	77	23	N	9,959,907	5,832,907	38.90	197,400	0
59(52)	Springfield, Mass.	149,554	7,969,000	1,613,000	5,655,000	15,237,000	N	N	N	N	15,237,000	9,582,000	64.07	N	0
60(54)	Bridgeport, Conn.	147,121	10,677,000	2,636,000	N	13,313,000	N	N	N	N	13,313,000	13,313,000	90.49	N	0
61(62)	Norfolk, Va.[26]	144,332	17,053,031	6,800,000	14,317,669	38,170,700	13,146,870	—	—	45	25,023,830	16,624,154	115.18	N	0
62(61)	Yonkers, N. Y.	142,598	20,901,650	7,228,950	5,132,250	33,262,850	N	N	N	N	33,262,850	28,130,600	197.31	1,373,600	100
63(58)	Tulsa, Okla.[40]	142,157	7,154,024	4,301,200	2,629,000	14,084,224	4,125,734	—	36	—	9,958,490	7,329,490	51.56	—	0
64(55)	Scranton, Pa.	140,404	2,479,000	6,359,000	N	8,838,000	206,790	25	75	N	8,631,210	8,631,210	61.47	459,326	0
65(60)	Paterson, N. J.	139,656	9,608,028	5,189,000	13,226,000	28,023,028	981,386	92	8	N	27,041,642	13,815,642	98.93	—	—
66(64)	Albany, N. Y.	130,577	15.369,375	4,489,600	12,992,000	32.850,975	1,643,588	99	N	1	31,207,387	18,231,923	139.63	215,000	100
67(67)	Chattanooga, Tenn.[41]	128,163	12,930,600	2,050,500	13,200,000	28,181,100	1,793,520	—	—	13	26,387,580	13,427,966	104.77	1,253,600	100
68(65)	Trenton, N. J.	124,697	10,806,760	7,282,963	1,124,800	19,214,523	1,492,169	30	43	27	17,722,354	17,003,308	136.36	12,000	100
69(70)	Spokane, Wash.	122,001	2,153,000	480,000	388,000	3,021.000	115,145	52	3	45	2,905,855	2,569,789	21.06	1,607,452	0
70(66)	Kansas City, Kans.	121,458	3,623,771	2,952,000	3,595,000	10,170,771	2,324,957	2	N	98	7,845,814	6,520,167	53.68	189,689	0

[31]**Syracuse.** General debt includes $75,000 municipal stadium bonds which are self-supporting.

[32]**San Diego, et al.** Utility debt is not self-supporting.

[33]**Richmond.** Debt as of January 31, 1941.

[34]**Honolulu.** All school debt (except for buildings and repairs which is included in general debt) is issued by the territory of Hawaii. Debt shown is combined city-county figure; per capita computed on basis of county population of 258,256.

[35]**Jacksonville.** School debt is not issued by the city, but by the school district. Utility debt includes $1,325,000 dock bonds not self-supporting.

[36]**Miami.** Debt as of June 30, 1940. School debt is city's share of net debt of four independent school districts.

[37]**Youngstown.** Division between utility and general city sinking fund not available.

[38]**Hartford.** Debt as of January 5, 1941.

[39]**Long Beach.** General debt includes city's share of county flood control debt, $2,070,484. Public utility debt includes city's share of metropolitan water debt, $17,673,231.

[40]**Tulsa.** Debt as of January 31, 1941. Utility debt not self-supporting; utility sinking fund not separated from general.

[41]**Chattanooga.** Debt as of September 30, 1940.

			GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
		Census 1940	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
71(72)	Fort Wayne, Ind.	118,410	439,900	1,962,000	1,596,000	3,997,900	N	N	N	N	3,997,900	2,401,900	20.28	3,000,000	0
72(68)	Camden, N. J.	117,536	21,507,260	3,650,000	1,024,075	26,181,335	1,365,740	65	28	7	24,815,595	23,890,738	203.26	N	0
73(69)	Erie, Pa.	116,955	4,716,000	4,576,874	1,215,000	10,507,874	145,120	100	N	N	10,362,754	9,147,754	78.22	523,291	0
74(71)	Fall River, Mass.	115,428	3,886,500	691,000	275,000	4,852,500	276,000	100	N	N	4,576,500	4,301,500	37.27	N	0
75(77)	Wichita, Kans.[42]	114,966	5,831,420	2,924,000	1,333,750	10,089,170	N	N	N	N	10,089,170	8,755,420	76.16	1,890,670	100
76(80)	Wilmington, Del.[43]	112,504	4,217,500	706,000	6,712,800	11,636,300	1,520,307	—	—	—	10,115,993	3,403,193	30.25	—	—
77(92)	Gary, Ind.[44]	111,719	4,813,297	3,140,000	N	7,953,297	14.220	91	9	N	7,939,077	7,939,077	71.06	—	—
78(81)	Knoxville, Tenn.	111,580	18,815,235	1,787,000	4,552,238	25,154,473	2,274,348	74	N	26	22,880,125	18,909,092	169.47	—	100
79(74)	Cambridge, Mass.	110,879	Not Reporting												
80(76)	Reading, Pa.	110,568	3,128,000	6,435,500	2,217,000	11,780,500	336,643	45	4	51	11,443,857	9,396,974	84.99	345,000	0
81(75)	New Bedford, Mass.[45]	110,341	5,804,000	849,000	930,000	7,583,000	951,330	100	N	N	6,631,670	5,701,670	51.67	N	0
82(73)	Elizabeth, N. J.	109,912	6,175,095	4,899,600	3,958,000	15,032,695	754,566	—	—	—	14,278,129	10,320,129	93.89	N	0
83(79)	Tacoma, Wash.	109,408	1,769,000	990,000	7,503,995	10,262,995	57,800	100	N	N	10,205,195	2,701,200	24.69	694,356	0
84(83)	Canton, Ohio	108,401	3,933,624	4,306,000	629,000	8,868,624	1,929,803	50	50	N	6,938,821	6,309,821	58.21	218,371	100
85(91)	Tampa, Fla.	108,391	Not Reporting												
86(96)	Sacramento, Calif.	105,958	3,930,470	5,547,000	3,430,500	12,907,970	N	N	N	N	12,907,970	9,477,470	89.45	349,018	0
87(82)	Peoria, Ill.	105,087	2,302,500	645,000	N	2,947,500	36,613	100	N	N	2,910,887	2,910,887	27.70	615,041	27
88(85)	Somerville, Mass.[32]	102,177	3,561,871	1,271,000	210,000	5,042,871	N	N	N	N	5,042,871	4,832,871	47.30	N	0
89(93)	Lowell, Mass.	101,389	4,596,219	304,000	363,000	5,263,219	N	N	N	N	5,263,219	4,900,219	48.33	N	0
90(84)	South Bend, Ind.[46]	101,268	2,536,390	1,807,000	575,000	4,918,390	379,406	33	N	67	4,538,984	4,219,795	41.67	2,000,000*	100
91(90)	Duluth, Minn.	101,065	4,211,666	2,182,000	2,414,500	8,808,166	N	N	N	N	8,808,166	6,393,666	63.26	150,000	0
92(103)	Charlotte, N. C.	100,899	4,441,533	1,288,000	3,004,000	8,733,533	576,708	29	15	56	8,156,825	5,476,814	54.28	1,402,967	100
93(89)	Utica, N. Y.	100,518	9,186,224	1,357,437	N	10,543,661	72,414	—	—	—	10,471,247	10,471,247	104.17	—	—
	Group IV Population 50,000 to 100,000														
94(94)	Waterbury, Conn.	99,314	9,527,000	1,039,000	5,988,000	16,554,000	N	N	N	N	16,554,000	10,566,000	106.39	N	0
95(115)	Shreveport, La.	98,167	Not Reporting												
96(87)	Lynn, Mass.	98,123	4,308,700	1,391,000	307,500	6,007,200	N	N	N	N	6,007,200	5,699,700	58.09	—	0
97(88)	Evansville, Ind.	97,062	1,544,200	1,624,500	1,487,000	4,655,700	259,141	63	N	37	4,396,559	3,005,196	30.96	157,273	100
98(97)	Allentown, Pa.	96,904	4,774,700	3,651,500	710,000	9,136,200	920,034	43	57	N	8,216,166	7,506,166	77.46	247,000	0
99(86)	El Paso, Tex.	96,810	3,098,000	1,816,802	1,557,000	6,471,802	265,022	60	19	21	6,206,780	4,705,006	48.60	—	—
100(102)	Savannah, Ga.	95,996	3,934,500	475,580	125,000	4,535,080	285,000	100	N	N	4,250,080	4,125,080	42.97	N	0
101(106)	Little Rock, Ark.	88,039	2,659,500	1,903,500	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
102(178)	Austin, Tex.	87,930	3,310,000	1,861,000	1,299,000	6,470,000	52,290	—	—	—	6,417,710	5,118,710	58.21	N	0

[42]**Wichita.** General debt includes city's share of county debt for welfare.
[43]**Wilmington.** Debt as of June 30, 1940. Utility debt is not self-supporting.
[44]**Gary.** General debt includes $2,652,000 bonds of independent sanitary district.
[45]**New Bedford.** Utility debt includes $68,000 wharf bonds not self-supporting.
[46]**South Bend.** General debt includes city's share ($661,940) of township relief debt and $394,450 park district debt.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
103(95)	Schenectady, N. Y.[26]	87,549	9,488,500	941,000	254,000	10,683,500	93,789	—	—	4	10,589,711	10,339,836	118.10	454,000	100
104(99)	Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	86,236	2,729,000	750,000	N	3,479,000	61,222	54	46	N	3,417,778	3,417,778	39.63	N	0
105(104)	Berkeley, Calif.	85,547	782,167	1,348,000	8,775,000	10,905,167	N	N	N	N	10,905,167	2,130,167	24.90	20,001	100
106(100)	Rockford, Ill.	84,637	561,250	2,406,000	20,000	2,987,250	937,700	9	91	N	2,049,550	2,029,550	23.98	650,000	0
107(101)	Lawrence, Mass.	84,323	2,350,000	304,500	442,000	3,096,500	N	N	N	N	3,096,500	2,654,500	31.48	—	—
108(109)	Harrisburg, Pa.	83,893	Not Reporting												
109(108)	Saginaw, Mich.[32]	82,794	426,000	254,000	1,874,000	2,554,000	N	N	N	N	2,554,000	680,000	8.21	262,400	65
110(147)	Glendale, Calif.[47]	82,582	1,167,000	3,508,000	250,000	4,925,000	N	N	N	N	4,925,000	4,675,000	56.61	92,200	0
111(110)	Sioux City, Iowa	82,364	3,120,000	1,025,000	450,000	4,595,000	107,289	100	N	N	4,487,711	4,037,711	49.02	59,000	0
112(117)	Lincoln, Neb.[48]	81,984	902,000	3,448,000	1,741,000	6,091,000	700,852	5	N	95	5,390,148	4,314,364	52.62	75,155	100
113(116)	Pasadena, Calif.[49]	81,864	2,840,444	2,672,600	5,893,356	11,406,400	137,917	N	N	100	11,268,483	5,513,044	67.34	2,153,203	0
114(103)	Altoona, Pa.	80,214	2,241,000	3,141,000	520,000	5,902,000	692,705	93	7	N	5,209,295	4,689,295	58.46	765,500	0
115(120)	Winston Salem, N. C.	79,815	8,417,060	3,490,882	2,473,058	14,381,000	323,089	79	N	21	14,057,911	11,652,910	146.00	192,000	100
116(98)	Bayonne, N. J.	79,198	Not Reporting												
117(118)	Huntington, W. Va.[50]	78,836	1,253,000	454,500	N	1,707,500	497,552	100	N	N	1,209,948	1,209,948	15.35	N	0
118(111)	Lansing, Mich.	78,753	674,000	N	773,000	1,447,000	692,000	N	N	100	755,000	674,000	8.56	N	0
119(129)	Mobile, Ala.[51]	78,720	8,351,000	—	5,244,000	13,595,000	199,524	100	N	N	13,395,476	8,151,476	103.55	N	0
120(114)	Binghamton, N. Y.	78,309	2,902,000	2,734,700	25,000	5,661,700	N	N	N	N	5,661,700	5,636,700	71.98	N	0
121(136)	Montgomery, Ala.	78,084	Not Reporting												
122(119)	Niagara Falls, N. Y.[52]	78,029	8,237,805	6,694,710	1,476,330	16,408,845	233,941	N	N	100	16,174,904	14,932,515	191.37	N	0
123(113)	Manchester, N. H.	77,685	3,179,945	352,305	89,250	3,621,500	N	N	N	N	3,621,500	3,532,250	45.47	—	—
124(123)	Quincy, Mass.	75,810	3,150,000	543,500	200,000	3,893,500	N	N	N	N	3,893,500	3,693,500	48.72	N	0
125(112)	Pawtucket, R. I.	75,797	10,595,000	3,391,000	2,747,000	16,733,000	2,687,852	50	33	17	14,045,148	11,761,149	155.17	—	—
126(107)	St. Joseph, Mo.	75,711	4,216,000	2,631,000	N	6,847,000	199,161	88	12	N	6,647,839	6,647,839	87.81	—	—
127(121)	East St. Louis, Ill.	75,609	Not Reporting												
128(124)	Springfield, Ill.	75,503	Not Reporting												
129(125)	Portland, Me.[53]	73,643	4,674,850	417,000	6,046,900	11,138,750	431,911	—	—	37	10,706,839	4,821,368	65.47	N	0
130(148)	Charleston, S. C.[54]	71,275	4,404,000	937,000	6,215,000	11,556,000	2,789,139	1	7	92	8,766,861	5,110,215	71.70	192,000	94
131(128)	Springfield, Ohio	70,662	Not Reporting												
132(122)	Troy, N. Y.	70,304	5,720,940	635,625	566,025	6,922,590	N	N	N	N	6,922,590	6,356,565	90.42	—	—
133(140)	Hammond, Ind.	70,184	3,169,070	1,522,500	1,047,000	5,738,570	174,405	53	9	38	5,564,165	4,583,237	65.30	4,397,206	0
134(137)	Newton, Mass.	69,873	3,572,000	1,613,000	606,000	5,791,000	N	N	N	N	5,791,000	5,185,000	74.21	N	0
135(127)	Roanoke, Va.[26]	69,287	3,950,000	2,551,000	4,800,000	11,301,000	1,180,177	—	—	9	10,120,823	5,429,870	78.37	N	0

[47]**Glendale.** Does not include city's share of Metropolitan Water District debt (6,033,194) nor flood control district debt ($697,586).

[48]**Lincoln.** General debt includes $73.000 sanitary district debt.

[49]**Pasadena.** Does not include city's share of overlapping debt; $8,257,069 metropolitan water district and $937,931 flood control.

[50]**Huntington.** Flood control debt of $1,010,000 not included.

[51]**Mobile.** Special assessment debt of $3,421,567 on February 29, 1940, refunded into general city obligation. School debt is included in general city debt.

[52]**Niagara Falls.** School debt includes $1,300,000 debt of school district specifically excluded by constitution from city debt when computing debt limit.

[53]**Portland, Me.** General debt includes Portland's share of bridge district and pier district debt. Utility debt is city's share of Portland Water District debt.

[54]**Charleston, S. C.** Utility debt includes $4,300,000 non-self-supporting port debt.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
136(126)	Lakewood, Ohio	69,160	1,795,855	1,892,500	1,850,500	5,538,855	453,906	83	9	8	5,084,949	3,271,613	47.30	10,120	100
137(131)	East Orange, N. J.	68,945	6,016,500	3,357,445	548,000	9,921,945	931,727	15	63	22	8,990,218	8,643,536	125.37	13,186	100
138(130)	New Britain, Conn.[55]	68,685	1,472,000	2,171,000	1,671,000	5,314,000	322,920	83	N	17	4,991,080	3,374,300	49.13	N	0
139(163)	San Jose, Calif.[56]	68,457	812,600	1,048,000	N	1,860,600	N	N	N	N	1,860,600	1,860,600	27.18	56,374	—
140(152)	Charleston, W. Va.	67,914	Not Reporting												
141(141)	Topeka, Kans.	67,833	638,312	1,589,000	535,000	2,762,312	535,000	N	N	100	2,227,312	2,227,312	32.84	413,514	100
142(160)	Madison, Wis.[57]	67,447	2,566,800	2,185,750	213,000	4,965,550	N	N	N	N	4,965,550	4,752,550	70.46	137,300	36
143(150)	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.	67,362	5,646,000	3,574,050	2,717,000	11,937,050	2,167,042	14	N	86	9,770,008	8,920,227	132.42	N	0
144(132)	Racine, Wis.	67,195	2,222,000	885,000	948,000	4,055,000	94,000	100	N	N	3,961,000	3,013,000	44.84	30,882	0
145(133)	Johnstown, Pa.	66,668	3,012,101	4,234,000	N	7,246,101	1,495,797	62	38	N	5,750,304	5,750,304	86.25	N	0
146(139)	Pontiac, Mich.[105]	66,626	3,200,250	2,033,575	1,438,000	6,671,825	272,031	100	N	N	6,399,794	4,961,794	74.47	1,257,000	100
147(151)	Davenport, Iowa	66,039	1,982,717	1,488,000	N	3,470,717	156,704	100	N	N	3,314,013	3,314,013	50.18	198,241	0
148(142)	Oak Park, Ill.	66,015	714,000	1,649,000	1,135,000	3,498,000	290,000	N	100	N	3,208,000	2,073,000	31.40	194,349	0
149(153)	Augusta, Ga.[32]	65,919	2,157,000	953,000	629,000	3,739,000	605,624	—	N	—	3,133,376	2,504,376	37.99	N	0
150(198)	Phoenix, Ariz.[32]	65,414	3,833,000	3,006,000	4,832,000	11,671,000	782,681	3	97	N	10,888,319	6,056,319	92.58	632,056	0
151(144)	Evanston, Ill.	65,389	657,000	2,580,000	59,000	3,296,000	240,545	N	90	10	3,055,455	2,021,138	30.91	801,878	0
152(134)	Cicero, Ill.	64,712	Not Reporting												
153(135)	Atlantic City, N. J.[106]	64,094	23,155,000	—	2,108,000	25,263,000	N	N	N	N	25,263,000	23,155,000	361.27	—	—
154(188)	Dearborn, Mich.[58]	63,584	10,862,000	5,579,838	1,994,000	18,435,838	6,149,077	84	2	14	12,286,761	11,172,987	175.72	118,750	100
155(155)	Medford, Mass.	63,083	2,937,500	765,000	418,000	4,120,500	5,000	100	N	N	4,115,500	3,697,500	58.61	N	0
156(146)	Terre Haute, Ind.[59]	62,693	889,500	490,000	N	1,379,500	67,385	24	76	N	1,312,115	1,312,115	20.93	—	—
157(185)	Columbia, S. C.	62,396	Not Reporting												
158(143)	Brockton, Mass.	62,343	2,525,634	50,000	607,300	3,182,934	N	N	N	N	3,182,934	2,575,634	41.31	—	—
159(169)	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	62,120	Not Reporting												
160(197)	Jackson, Miss.	62,107	4,369,290	967,500	594,750	5,931,540	270,000	100	N	N	5,661,540	5,066,790	81.58	295,070	100
161(138)	Covington, Ky.	62,018	1,455,000	1,429,000	2,153,500	5,037,500	N	N	N	N	5,037,500	2,884,000	46.50	—	—
162(145)	Passaic, N. J.	61,394	6,650,500	1,721,000	7,256,000	15,627,500	1,305,148	71	N	29	14,322,352	7,442,409	121.22	N	0
163(154)	Lancaster, Pa.[60]	61,345	1,375,000	3,118,000	2,550,000	7,043,000	797,241	3	97	N	6,245,759	3,695,759	60.25	N	0
164(164)	Springfield, Mo.	61,238	1,245,135	1,389,500	N	2,634,635	295,100	65	35	N	2,339,535	2,339,535	38.20	—	—
165(149)	Wheeling, W. Va.[32]	61,099	1,840,100	1,680,500	1,200,000	4,720,600	52,474	N	100	N	4,668,126	3,468,126	56.76	N	0
166(180)	Galveston, Tex.[61]	60,862	4,092,500	1,854,000	6,719,500	12,666,000	741,113	81	14	5	11,924,887	5,243,352	86.15	N	0
167(234)	St. Petersburg, Fla.	60,812	19,434,500	2,450,250	3,297,000	25,181,750	461,911	58	36	6	24,719,839	21,449,086	352.71	N	0
168(182)	Fresno, Calif.	60,685	719,000	3,000,000	2,165,000	5,884,000	449,020	3	32	65	5,434,980	3,562,132	58.70	—	—
169(184)	Durham, N. C.	60,195	4,050,473	1,205,391	3,265,000	8,520,864	316,636	100	N	N	8,204,228	4,939,228	82.05	1,174,783	100
170(177)	Greensboro, N. C.	59,319	7,202,745	2,082,300	2,581,020	11,866,065	229,397	55	N	45	11,636,668	9,159,363	154.41	3,552,235	100

[55]**New Britain.** General debt does not include $567,000 revenue anticipation serial coupon notes.

[56]**San Jose.** Debt as of November 30, 1940.

[57]**Madison.** Utility debt includes $73,000 water bonds not self-supporting.

[58]**Dearborn.** General debt includes $534,000 refunding debt to be retired from delinquent special assessments, but also considered general obligations of the city. Debt as of January 31, 1941.

[59]**Terre Haute.** General debt includes $432,000 bonds of park district which is independent of the city.

[60]**Lancaster.** Debt as of January 4, 1941. Utility debt not self-suporting.

[61]**Galveston.** General debt includes $427,000 grade-raising bonds serviced by state aid.

			GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
		Census 1940	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
171(165)	Decatur, Ill.	59,305	Not Reporting												
172(157)	Chester, Pa.	59,285	Not Reporting												
173(162)	Beaumont, Tex.[62]	59,061	4,352,000	1,863,138	2,401,000	8,616,138	377,263	38	20	42	8,238,875	5,996,125	101.52	24,000	100
174(161)	Bethlehem, Pa.[63]	58,490	1,373,000	2,405,000	2,728,500	6,506,500	900,553	1	76	23	5,605,947	3,081,764	52.69	N	0
175(175)	New Rochelle, N. Y.	58,408	8,516,000	4,951,000	N	13,467,000	117,689	—	—	—	13,349,311	13,349,311	228.55	3,297	—
176(159)	Malden, Mass.	58,010	2,527,000	1,154,000	105,000	3,786,000	201,777	100	N	N	3,584,223	3,479,223	59.98	94,267	100
177(176)	Macon, Ga.	57,865	838,000	646,800	N	1,484,800	N	N	N	N	1,484,800	1,484,800	25.66	N	0
178	Corpus Christi, Tex.[64]	57,301	8,438,143	1,639,000	1,328,000	11,405,143	1,104,072	79	9	12	10,301,071	9,107,930	158.95	N	0
179(170)	York, Pa.	56,712	1,159,500	1,850,000	N	3,009,500	272,166	65	35	N	2,737,334	2,737,334	48.27	600	0
180(158)	Union City, N. J.	56,173	5,034,875	1,540,000	N	6,574,875	87,969	72	28	N	6,486,906	6,486,906	115.48	6,000	100
181(181)	Waco, Tex.[32]	55,982	2,972,500	1,427,800	1,680,000	6,080,300	991,240	—	—	—	5,089,060	3,409,060	60.90	N	0
182(174)	McKeesport, Pa.	55,355	Not Reporting												
183(166)	Irvington, N. J.[65]	55,328	3,801,000	3,381,150	N	7,182,150	326,380	57	43	N	6,855,770	6,855,770	123.91	N	0
184(186)	Cleveland Heights, Ohio	54,992	594,500	4,403,500	N	4,998,000	706,559	12	88	N	4,291,441	4,291,441	78.04	310,000	100
185(199)	Stockton, Calif.	54,714	4,668,975	310,000	N	4,978,975	N	N	N	N	4,978,975	4,978,975	91.00	14,978	0
186(173)	East Chicago, Ind.	54,637	Not Reporting												
187(172)	Kalamazoo, Mich.[66]	54,097	N	—	N	—	—	N	—	N	—	—	—	—	—
188(167)	Holyoke, Mass.	53,750	372,000	362,000	692,000	1,426,000	N	N	N	N	1,426,000	734,000	13.66	N	0
189(253)	Santa Monica, Calif.[67]	53,500	1,683,500	1,724,500	935,000	4,343,000	157,746	24	61	15	4,185,254	3,273,451	61.19	175,000	100
190(221)	Columbus, Ga.	53,280	1,668,900	639,600	60,000	2,368,500	N	N	N	N	2,368,500	2,308,500	43.33	7,300	100
191(191)	Pueblo, Colo.[68]	52,162	3,446,000	1,292,000	7,706,400	12,444,400	N	N	N	N	12,444,400	4,738,000	90.83	867,000	0
192(208)	Waterloo, Iowa	51,743	Not Reporting												
193(220)	Amarillo, Tex.	51,686	2,958,600	1,684,000	1,961,980	6,604,580	382,830	60	37	3	6,221,750	4,268,306	82.58	N	0
194(190)	Asheville, N. C.[69]	51,310	15,050,059	2,704,550	5,082,930	22,837,539	N	N	N	N	22,837,539	17,754,609	346.03	N	0
195(179)	Highland Park, Mich.	50,810	965,000	2,800,000	138,000	3,903,000	1,874,650	49	46	5	2,028,350	1,992,711	39.22	25,700	100
196(212)	Portsmouth, Va.[32]	50,745	5,101,000	596,000	2,973,000	8,670,000	2,619,545	29	N	71	6,050,455	4,944,425	97.44	N	0
197(183)	Hamilton, Ohio	50,592	1,325,786	843,000	764,000	2,932,786	103,595	62	38	N	2,829,191	2,065,191	40.82	101,751	100
198(156)	Hoboken, N. J.	50,115	Not Reporting												
	Group V Population 30,000 to 50,000														
199(168)	Hamtramck, Mich.[32]	49,839	3,569,978	2,761,000	491,000	6,821,978	1,052,315	33	67	N	5,769,663	5,278,663	105.91	N	0
200(200)	Brookline, Mass.[32]	49,786	591,000	572,000	332,000	1,495,000	N	N	N	N	1,495,000	1,163,000	23.36	—	—

[62]**Beaumont.** Utility debt includes $1,903,000 wharf debt not self-supporting.

[63]**Bethlehem.** Utility debt includes $2,150,000 bonds of independent Bethlehem Municipal Water Authority.

[64]**Corpus Christi.** General debt includes $3,325,000 sea wall and breakwater construction debt serviced by state aid.

[65]**Irvington.** General debt includes $252,000 school refunding bonds.

[66]**Kalamazoo.** The city of Kalamazoo has no outstanding debt. School district debt was not available at time of this tabulation.

[67]**Santa Monica.** Does not include city's share of Metropolitan Water District debt ($4,844,957) nor flood control district debt ($501,207). Utility debt is not self-supporting.

[68]**Pueblo.** General debt includes $2,927,000 flood control which, together with light and power debt of $6,763,400 is not a city obligation. Utility debt includes $943,000 water bonds not self-supporting.

[69]**Asheville.** General debt includes $1,019,956 debt of four sanitary districts assumed by the city.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	SINKING FUNDS Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	NET BONDED DEBT Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
201(206)	Muncie, Ind.	49,720	844,447	725,000	880,000	2,449,447	N	N	N	N	2,449,447	1,569,447	31.57	—	—
202(192)	Pittsfield, Mass.	49,684	913,000	411,000	155,000	1,479,000	N	N	N	N	1,479,000	1,324,000	26.65	N	0
203(171)	Jackson, Mich.[70]	49,656	1,327,000	1,123,000	1,263,500	3,713,500	N	N	N	N	3,713,500	2,450,000	49.34	174,500	100
204(210)	Lexington, Ky.	49,304	2,185,000	561,000	N	2,746,000	427,068	91	9	N	2,318,932	2,318,932	47.03	38,349	0
205(193)	Woonsocket, R. I.	49,303	5,667,000	978,000	716,000	7,361,000	1,485,260	91	9	N	5,875,740	5,159,740	104.65	N	0
206(204)	Clifton, N. J.	48,827	Not Reporting												
207(189)	Kenosha, Wis.	48,765	334,500	2,340,000	500,000	3,174,500	N	N	N	N	3,174,500	2,674,500	54.84	111,155	0
208(203)	Berwyn, Ill.	48,451	Not Reporting												
209(202)	Bay City, Mich.	47,956	422,000	571,500	1,196,000	2,189,500	247,772	37	32	31	1,941,728	822,807	17.16	204,000	100
210(207)	Stamford, Conn.	47,938	2,805,348	2,226,500	N	5,031,848	373,061	9	91	N	4,658,787	4,658,787	97.18	N	0
211(229)	Muskegon, Mich.	47,697	1,585,000	1,782,812	901,000	4,268,812	270,766	100	N	N	3,998,046	3,097,046	64.93	45,570	100
212(195)	New Castle, Pa.	47,638	728,000	1,891,000	N	2,619,000	67,280	93	7	N	2,551,720	2,551,720	53.56	N	0
213(205)	Aurora, Ill.	47,170	578,500	435,000	269,000	1,282,500	N	N	N	N	1,282,500	1,013,500	21.49	—	—
214(223)	Cranston, R. I.	47,085	2,563,500	2,179,000	N	4,742,500	198,729	N	100	N	4,543,771	4,543,771	96.50	N	0
215(251)	Raleigh, N. C.[71]	46,897	2,238,000	1,501,950	1,939,000	5,678,950	173,294	100	N	N	5,505,656	3,566,656	76.05	858,000	100
216(196)	Everett, Mass.[32]	46,784	1,270,900	436,000	107,000	1,813,900	N	N	N	N	1,813,900	1,706,900	36.48	N	0
217(194)	Haverhill, Mass.	46,752	1,361,300	60,000	116,000	1,537,300	N	N	N	N	1,537,300	1,421,300	30.40	N	0
218(250)	Green Bay, Wis.	46,235	204,000	1,432,500	757,000	2,393,500	240,946	N	87	13	2,152,554	1,426,554	30.85	—	—
219(187)	Port Arthur, Tex.[72]	46,140	3,805,600	1,868,000	662,500	6,336,100	338,179	81	11	8	5,997,921	5,360,450	116.18	N	0
220(216)	Wichita Falls, Tex.[73]	45,112	3,200,000	1,781,000	2,976,000	7,957,000	139,451	N	24	76	7,817,549	4,946,846	109.66	—	—
221(201)	Elmira, N. Y.	45,106	2,052,000	904,000	300,000	3,256,000	N	N	N	N	3,256,000	2,956,000	65.53	N	0
222(225)	Lima, Ohio	44,711	2,433,500	410,000	373,000	3,216,500	N	N	N	N	3,216,500	2,843,500	63.60	N	0
223(233)	Lynchburg, Va.	44,541	2,427,445	826,976	2,449,208	5,703,629	1,106,679	35	16	49	4,596,950	2,687,742	60.34	N	0
224(211)	Williamsport, Pa.	44,355	530,000	895,000	N	1,425,000	214,332	12	88	N	1,210,668	1,210,668	27.29	43,800	0
225(214)	Lorain, Ohio	44,125	1,137,247	501,000	73,000	1,711,247	16,263	100	N	N	1,694,984	1,621,984	36.76	233,386	100
226(228)	Dubuque, Iowa	43,892	Not Reporting												
227(236)	Ogden, Utah	43,688	Not Reporting												
228(249)	San Bernardino, Calif.	43,646	521,500	866,200	182,325	1,570,025	154,969	24	70	6	1,415,056	1,241,883	28.45	N	0
229(217)	Battle Creek, Mich.	43,453	463,000	773,500	288,000	1,524,500	N	N	N	N	1,524,500	1,236,500	28.46	—	—
230(230)	Warren, Ohio[74]	42,837	1,242,600	619,450	280,000	2,142,050	123,370	N	33	67	2,018,680	1,821,680	42.53	36,000	100
231(247)	Rock Island, Ill.	42,775	Not Reporting												
232(240)	La Crosse, Wis.	42,707	557,000	753,000	21,000	1,331,000	6,500	—	—	—	1,324,500	1,303,500	30.52	34,798	0
233(213)	Jamestown, N. Y.[74]	42,638	537,233	1,643,000	379,000	2,559,233	89,120	N	N	100	2,470,113	2,180,233	51.13	25,000	100
234(222)	Joliet, Ill.[74]	42,365	649,000	1,166,790	84,000	1,899,790	N	N	N	N	1,899,790	1,815,790	42.86	523,626	—
235(232)	Fitchburg, Mass.[32]	41,824	1,102,700	668,000	206,200	1,976,900	N	N	N	N	1,976,900	1,770,700	42.34	N	0

[70]**Jackson.** Public utility debt includes $758,500 water bonds not self-supporting.
[71]**Raleigh.** School debt as of June 30, 1940.
[72]**Port Arthur.** General debt includes $1,295,000 sea wall bonds retired from remission of 8/9 of state taxes collected.
[73]**Wichita Falls.** Utility debt includes city's share ($2,576,000) of Wichita County Water District debt which is not self-supporting.
[74]**Warren et al.** School debt is not an obligation of the city.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
236(215)	Chicopee, Mass.	41,664	Not Reporting												
237(246)	Bloomfield, N. J.	41,623	2,192,000	2,543,500	1,062,000	5,797,500	21,000	71	N	29	5,776,500	4,714,500	113.27	N	0
238(238)	Anderson, Ind.	41,572	Not Reporting												
239(226)	Council Bluffs, Iowa	41,439	Not Reporting												
240(209)	Chelsea, Mass.	41,259	1,884,800	250,500	N	2,135,300	428,106	100	N	N	1,707,194	1,707,194	41.38	N	0
241(218)	Perth Amboy, N. J.	41,242	8,279,500	1,270,000	1,586,000	11,135,500	477,561	29	42	29	10,657,939	9,209,099	223.29	N	0
242(219)	Salem, Mass.	41,213	908,442	93,000	174,000	1,175.442	N	N	N	N	1,175,442	1,001,442	24.30	—	—
243(284)	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.[82]	40,832	642,000	1,066,000	38,000	1,746,000	719,534	9	90	1	1,026,466	994,484	24.36	N	0
244(242)	Sheboygan, Wis.	40,638	1,175,000	535,000	122,000	1,832,000	N	N	N	N	1,832,000	1,710,000	42.08	40,560	0
245(235)	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	40,478	3,469,908	1,057,000	338,000	4,864,908	21,677	65	35	N	4,843,231	4,505,231	111.30	90,149	100
246(244)	Quincy, Ill.[75]	40,469	N	662,000	191,000	853,000	14,852	N	100	N	838,148	647,148	15.99	119,461	0
247(224)	Portsmouth, Ohio	40,466	3,280,200	1,362,000	1,201,000	5,843,200	111,416	37	11	52	5,731,784	4,588,523	113.39	36,000	100
248(265)	White Plains, N. Y.	40,327	4,678,274	6,556,000	1,080,000	12,314,274	468,860	61	37	2	11,845,414	10,774,511	267.18	N	0
249(243)	Waltham, Mass.	40,020	Not Reporting												
250(261)	Arlington, Mass.	40,013	43,000	365,000	8,000	416,000	13,475	100	N	N	402,525	394,525	9.86	N	—
251(262)	Norwalk, Conn.[83]	39,849	2,105,000	1,866,000	816,000	4,807,000	213,308	—	—	—	4,593,692	3,777,692	94.80	N	0
252(227)	Montclair, N. J.	39,807	Not Reporting												
253(239)	East Cleveland, Ohio	39,495	899,000	1,304,000	N	2,203,000	679,996	40	60	N	1,523,004	1,523,004	38.56	143,500	100
254(245)	Meriden, Conn.	39,494	413,000	753,000	48,000	1,214,000	11,454	100	N	N	1,202,546	1,154,546	29.23	—	—
255(248)	Cumberland, Md.	39,483	2,587,000	1,357,000	3,174,900	7,118,900	1,250,915	36	N	64	5,867,985	3,494,319	88.50	N	0
256(231)	Kearny, N. J.[76]	39,467	5,175,000	1,805,000	4,850,000	11,830,000	208,000	100	N	N	11,622,000	6,772,000	171.58	N	0
257(254)	West New York, N. J.	39,439	Not Reporting												
258(288)	Laredo, Tex.[77]	39,274	1,003,000	566,000	N	1,569,000	82,212	75	25	N	1,486,788	1,486,788	37.86	—	—
259(237)	Oshkosh, Wis.[78]	39,089	487,000	305,000	473,000	1,265,000	N	N	N	N	1,265,000	792,000	20.26	N	0
260	Alhambra, Calif.	38,935	Not Reporting												
261(270)	Lewiston, Me.	38,598	Not Reporting												
262(257)	High Point, N. C.[79]	38,495	4,593,794	1,899,791	2,561,613	9,055,198	342,890	—	—	—	8,712,308	6,150,694	159.78	3,741,210	100
263(263)	Elgin, Ill.	38,333	949,000	516,000	138,000	1,603,000	78,279	75	N	25	1,524,721	1,405,972	36.68	191,825	0
264(264)	Norristown, Pa.[26]	38,181	595,000	1,475,000	N	2,070,000	326,641	—	—	N	1,743,359	1,743,359	45.66	N	0
265(255)	Hazleton, Pa.	38,009	1,620,500	1,233,000	N	2,853,500	189,849	16	84	N	2,663,651	2,663,651	70.08	—	—
266(267)	Steubenville, Ohio	37,651	351,490	754,750	23,000	1,129,240	29,869	33	67	N	1,099,371	1,076,371	28.59	676,540	100
267(259)	Zanesville, Ohio	37,500	589,020	344,500	120,000	1,053,520	194,247	4	96	N	859,273	739,273	19.71	64,935	0
268(276)	Plainfield, N. J.[26]	37,469	2,778,000	1,579,000	N	4,357,000	113,193	—	—	N	4,243,807	4,243,807	113.26	20,768	100
269(297)	Pensacola, Fla.	37,449	2,117,000	—	260,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	N	0
270(252)	Taunton, Mass.	37,395	Not Reporting												

[75]**Quincy.** Debt as of February 1, 1941. Utility debt is not self-supporting.

[76]**Kearny.** Surplus of $138,802 is available for retirement of serial bonds. Utility debt is only partially self-supporting.

[77]**Laredo.** Debt as of March 31, 1941.

[78]**Oshkosh.** Debt as of March 27, 1941.

[79]**High Point.** Electric revenues are pledged for retirement of $2,951,000 of general city debt although this amount is full faith and credit of the city as well.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	SINKING FUNDS Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	NET BONDED DEBT Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
271(280)	Mansfield, Ohio	37,154	Not Reporting												
272(281)	Joplin, Mo.	37,144	367,500	746,000	N	1,113,500	145,839	62	38	N	967,661	967,661	26.05	N	0
273(241)	Butte, Mont.[80]	37,081	1,067,521	632,858	N	1,700,379	107,466	69	31	N	1,592,913	1,592,913	42.96	—	0
274(277)	Newport News, Va.[26]	37,067	2,348,000	1,162,000	2,839,000	6,349,000	1,410,911	—	—	N	4,938,089	2,099,089	56.63	N	0
275	Gadsden, Ala.[81]	36,975	1,737,500	780,000	95,500	2,613,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	155,000	0
276(256)	Danville, Ill.[74]	36,919	117,000	344,322	N	461,322	N	N	N	N	461,322	461,322	12.50	77,600	0
277(289)	Tucson, Ariz.	36,818	1,249,000	816,800	828,000	2,893,800	651,659	54	15	31	2,242,141	1,614,141	43.84	864,441	100
278(285)	Colorado Springs, Colo.	36,789	394,000	637,000	1,462,000	2,493,000	75,503	N	N	100	2,417,497	1,031,000	28.02	22,500	0
279	Orlando, Fla.	36,736	4,219,000	1,092,500	1,225,000	6,536,500	855,936	17	16	67	5,680,564	5,031,037	136.95	N	0
280(299)	Fort Smith, Ark.	36,584	129,000	747,750	1,208,000	2,084,750	278,200	24	N	76	1,806,550	811,050	22.17	364,680	0
281(273)	West Allis, Wis.[82]	36,364	1,111,000	923,000	242,000	2,276,000	N	N	N	N	2,276,000	2,034,000	55.93	413,346	0
282(269)	Alameda, Calif.[82]	36,256	125,170	1,061,350	3,201,255	4,387,775	N	N	N	N	4,387,775	1,186,520	32.73	63,697	100
283(258)	Auburn, N. Y.	35,753	Not Reporting												
284(268)	Orange, N. J.[83]	35,717	2,956,000	1,209,500	188,000	4,353,500	300,642	40	60	N	4,052,858	3,864,858	108.21	N	0
285(296)	Meridian, Miss.[84]	35,481	1,971,768	844,411	440,000	3,256,179	18,492	98	2	N	3,237,687	2,797,687	78.85	195,438	100
286	Albuquerque, N. Mex.[85]	35,449	1,757,500	697,000	834,000	3,288,500	436,422	52	8	40	2,852,078	2,189,969	61.78	539,500	0
287(271)	Watertown, Mass.[82]	35,427	786,000	331,000	3,000	1,120,000	N	N	N	N	1,120,000	1,117,000	31.53	N	0
288(290)	Richmond, Ind.	35,147	563,000	630,000	N	1,193,000	43,282	93	7	N	1,149,718	1,149,718	32.71	135,294	0
289(260)	Superior, Wis.	35,136	660,643	1,317,628	N	1,978,271	N	N	N	N	1,978,271	1,978,271	56.30	N	0
290(278)	Santa Barbara, Calif.[32]	34,958	984,525	1,206,625	578,250	2,769,400	248,371	28	48	24	2,521,029	2,001,543	57.26	—	—
291	Greenville, S. C.[86]	34,734	1,511,000	555,100	4,460,000	6,526,100	708,753	—	1	—	5,817,347	1,357,347	39.08	48,060	0
292(306)	Baton Rouge, La.	34,719	Not Reporting												
293	Riverside, Calif.	34,696	161,067	1,037,720	531,800	1,730,586	N	N	N	N	1,730,586	1,198,787	34.55	5,294	0
294(293)	Moline, Ill.	34,608	649,500	568,000	296,000	1,513,500	N	N	N	N	1,513,500	1,217,500	35.18	113,635	0
295(266)	Revere, Mass.	34,405	Not Reporting												
296	Burbank, Calif.[87]	34,337	249,350	2,211,000	565,250	3,025,600	N	N	N	N	2,460,350	2,460,350	71.65	175,000	0
297(282)	Waukegan, Ill.	34,241	Not Reporting												
298(291)	Rome, N. Y.	34,214	Not Reporting												
299(283)	Norwood, Ohio[82]	34,010	521,610	682,750	96,000	1,300,360	207,137	96	4	N	1,093,223	997,223	29.32	N	0
300(287)	Kokomo, Ind.	33,795	385,000	456,000	308,000	1,149,000	N	N	N	N	1,149,000	841,000	24.89	—	—
301	West Hartford, Conn.[26]	33,776	741,000	1,637,000	N	2,378,000	398,684	—	—	N	1,979,316	1,979,316	58.60	N	0
302(279)	Paducah, Ky.	33,765	1,568,000	88,000	2,189,000	3,845,000	155,717	52	29	19	3,689,283	1,529,409	45.30	—	—
303	West Palm Beach, Fla.[88]	33,693	11,642,125	784,730	N	12,426,855	258,370	78	22	N	12,168,485	12,168,485	361.15	N	0
304(275)	Easton, Pa.[89]	33,589	2,483,900	1,357,000	3,478,000	7,318,900	856,683	—	—	N	6,462,217	2,984,217	88.84	N	0
305	Alexandria, Va.[90]	33,523	2,852,900	—	N	2,852,900	N	N	N	N	2,852,900	2,852,900	85.10	N	0

[80]**Butte.** Debt as of June 30, 1940.

[81]**Gadsden.** Debt as of September 30, 1940. Utility debt is not self-supporting.

[82]**Alameda.** Utility debt includes city's share of East Bay Municipal Utility District debt ($3,167,775).

[83]**Orange.** Utility debt includes $90,000 light and power debt not self-supporting.

[84]**Meridian.** Debt as of September 30, 1940.

[85]**Albuquerque.** Debt as of July 1, 1940.

[86]**Greenville.** General debt includes $35,000 swimming pool and $12,500 skating rink bonds which are self-supporting. Division between utility and general sinking fund not available.

[87]**Burbank.** Does not include city's share of flood control debt ($298,965) nor Metropolitan Water District debt ($3,254,736).

[88]**West Palm Beach.** Winter population estimated at 60,000.

[89]**Easton.** Debt as of January 6, 1941. Separation of school and general sinking fund not available.

[90]**Alexandria.** School debt is included in general debt.

		Census 1940	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
306(286)	Elkhart, Ind.	33,434	32,000	465,900	1,075,000	1,572,900	74,604	2	N	98	1,498,296	496,422	14.85	N	0
307(292)	Wilmington, N. C.	33,407	Not Reporting												
308(294)	Watertown, N. Y.	33,385	2,146,966	858,000	508,000	3,512,966	246,161	59	41	N	3,266,805	2,758,805	82.64	2,393	0
309(272)	Amsterdam, N Y.	33,329	726,100	1,649,350	69,000	2,444,450	66,512	N	40	60	2,377,938	2,348,868	70.48	6,282	0
310(274)	New Brunswick, N. J.	33,180	2,792,000	1,126,000	967,000	4,885,000	N	N	N	N	4,885,000	3,918,000	118.08	N	0
311	University City, Mo.[74]	33,023	1,875,000	1,452,075	N	3,327,075	N	N	N	N	3,327,075	3,327,075	100.75	N	0
312(298)	Nashua, N. H.[28]	32,927	1,066,000	432,000	N	1,498,000	46,842	—	—	N	1,451,158	1,451,158	44.07	N	0
313(303)	Bloomington, Ill.	32,868	Not Reporting												
314(300)	Port Huron, Mich.	32,759	887,498	228,000	20,000	1,135,498	137,568	100	N	N	997,930	977,930	29.85	92,889	100
315	Danville, Va.	32,749	1,483,000	406,000	2,257,200	4,146,200	27,556	100	N	N	4,118,644	1,861,444	56.84	N	0
316	Fargo, N. Dak.[91]	32,580	30,000	73,000	462,000	565,000	124,294	4	6	90	440,706	90,058	2.76	876,872	100
317(304)	Hagerstown, Md.[92]	32,491	2,080,000	640,000	2,662,000	5,382,000	N	N	N	N	5,382,000	2,720,000	83.72	N	0
318(295)	Muskogee, Okla.	32,332	Not Reporting												
319	Spartanburg, S. C.	32,249	2,187,000	968,000	1,402,000	4,557,000	1,263,426	54	44	2	3,293,574	1,920,157	59.54	N	0
320	East Providence, R. I.[93]	32,165	1,854,000	946,000	702,500	3,502,500	542,040	—	—	—	2,960,460	2,257,960	70.20	N	0
321(309)	Santa Ana, Calif.	31,921	380,360	1,515,000	87,575	1,982,935	176,908	18	73	9	1,806,027	1,734,436	54.34	418,965	0
322(301)	Newburgh, N. Y.	31,883	1,077,637	1,563,656	467,731	3,109,024	32,447	84	16	N	3,076,577	2,608,846	81.83	4,000	100
323	Lubbock, Tex.	31,853	Not Reporting												
324	Ottumwa, Iowa[94]	31,570	1,197,500	795,000	50,000	2,042,500	25,000	N	100	N	2,017,500	1,967,500	62.32	32,783	0
325(307)	Newark, Ohio	31,487	Not Reporting												
326(310)	Alton, Ill.	31,255	Not Reporting												
327	Middletown, Ohio	31,220	553,417	866,000	25,000	1,444,417	N	N	N	N	1,444,417	1,419,417	45.46	1,280	100
328	Salem, Ore.	30,908	591,000	484,500	2,173,000	3,248,500	131,469	N	N	100	3,117,031	1,075,500	34.80	312,107	100
329(302)	Marion, Ohio	30,817	Not Reporting												
330	Eau Claire, Wis.	30,745	552,000	234,000	202,000	988,000	N	N	N	N	988,000	786,000	25.57	N	0
331	Newport, Ky.	30,631	1,740,500	266,000	245,000	2,251,500	125,016	70	25	5	2,126,484	1,888,192	61.64	5,600	100
332	Petersburg, Va.[95]	30,631	4,439,000	800,000	N	5,239,000	1,872,297	—	—	—	3,366,704	3,366,704	109.91	N	0
333	Wyandotte, Mich.	30,618	642,257	513,435	547,919	1,703,611	732,895	51	27	22	970,716	588,694	19.23	88,528	100
334	Clarksburg, W. Va.	30,579	Not Reporting												
335	Newport, R. I.	30,532	1,745,000	612,000	3,100,000	5,457,000	232,800	61	39	N	5,224,200	2,124,200	69.57	N	0
336	New London, Conn.[96]	30,456	4,086,000	467,000	950,000	5,503,000	398,351	—	—	71	5,104,649	4,439,248	145.76	N	0
337	Owensboro, Ky.[97]	30,245	1,401,000	284,000	1,505,000	3,190,000	N	N	N	N	3,190,000	1,685,000	55.71	—	—
338(308)	Everett, Wash.	30,224	756,000	282,000	1,665,000	2,703,000	251,555	38	19	43	2,451,445	894,049	29.58	193,940	0
339	Bristol, Conn.	30,167	Not Reporting												
340	Inglewood, Calif.[98]	30,114	40,000	424,887	262,500	727,387	N	N	N	N	727,387	464,887	15.44	105,795	100

[91]**Fargo.** General debt shown is issued by park district.
[92]**Hagerstown.** Utility debt includes $2,359,000 water debt not self-supporting.
[93]**East Providence.** Debt as of April 1, 1941.
[94]**Ottumwa.** Water debt is not a city obligation.
[95]**Petersburg** It is estimated that $500,000 of general bonds are invested in water department which is self-supporting.
[96]**New London.** Debt as of March 31, 1941. Separation of school and general sinking fund not available.
[97]**Owensboro.** Debt as of May 31, 1940.
[98]**Inglewood.** Does not include city's share of flood control debt ($208,103) nor sanitation district debt ($296,180).

		Population	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
			General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Improvement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
341	Parkersburg, W. Va.	30,103	Not Reporting												
342	West Haven, Conn.	30,021	Not Reporting												
343	Hutchinson, Kans.	30,013	Not Reporting												
1	Montreal, Que.[99]	910,000	163,304,861	37,372,000	68,153,794	268,830,655	57,090,844	—	14	—	211,739,811	143,586,017	157.79	37,166,536	18
2	Toronto, Ont.	648,309	Not Reporting												
3	Vancouver, B. C.[100]	272,352	42,226,350	10,471,370	9,598,887	62,296,607	14,843,714	47	26	27	47,452,893	41,833,641	153.60	6,240,654	100
4	Winnipeg, Man.	215,814	Not Reporting												
5	Hamilton, Ont.	155,836	13,536,816	2,829,802	5,095,748	21,462,366	499,546	4	N	96	20,962,820	16,348,913	104.91	780,943	100
6	Quebec, Que.	151,432	Not Reporting												
7	Ottawa, Ont.	150,277	8,912,479	2,981,626	5,714,119	17,608,224	4,774,856	35	11	54	12,833,368	9,691,887	64.49	2,003,003	100
8	Windsor, Ont.[101]	103,567	28,195,417	4,180,562	—	32,375,979	1,735,606	—	—	—	30,640,373	—	—	—	—
9	Edmonton, Alta.	91,723	19,984,228	3,135,351	5,201,427	28,321,006	5,182,311	93	7	N	23,138,695	17,937,268	195.56	1,311,452	100
10	Calgary, Alta.	85,726	2,460,487	1,729,033	9,716,718	13,906,238	1,269,987	100	N	N	12,636,251	2,919,533	34.06	1,754,685	100
11	London, Ont.[102]	77,369	3,575,127	1,655,423	2,602,450	7,833,000	2,835,634	37	22	41	4,997,366	3,565,987	46.09	269,135	100
12	Verdun, Que.[103]	64,314	8,670,797	3,944,059	100,000	12,714,856	2,928,752	88	10	2	9,786,104	9,731,169	151.31	1,752,500	100
13	Halifax, N. S.	63,582	Not Reporting												
14	Regina, Sask.[104]	53,389	7,133,909	2,324,246	5,826,176	15,284,331	7,496,137	42	10	48	7,788,194	5,537,482	103.72	3,091,028	100
15	St. John, N. B.	50,200	Not Reporting												
16	Saskatoon, Sask.	41,734	6,380,194	2,580,750	3,591,657	12,552,601	5,648,993	43	13	44	6,903,608	5,790,502	138.75	1,913,982	100
17	Three Rivers, Que.	40,185	Not Reporting												
18	Victoria, B. C.	39,082	8,713,303	110,000	4,622,419	13,445,722	159,381	—	—	—	13,286,341	8,663,922	221.69	N	0

[99]**Montreal.** Debt as of October 31, 1940. Separation of general and utility sinking fund not available.

[100]**Vancouver.** Sinking fund does not include $15,517,600 owing by the city.

[101]**Windsor.** Figures show total debt for all purposes including special assessments and utilities. Separation of debt into general and utility debt is not possible.

[102]**London.** Utility debt includes $1,522,519 electric radial bonds not self-supporting.

[103]**Verdun.** General debt includes $12,246 consolidated tax bonds retired from collection of delinquent taxes.

[104]**Regina.** General debt includes $100,000 municipal airport bonds. Utility debt includes $1,969,318 street railway bonds which are not self-supporting.

[105]**Pontiac.** Utility debt includes $1,238,000 water debt not self-supporting.

[106]**Atlantic City.** General debt includes $140,000 bonds in lieu of delinquent state taxes. School debt included in general debt under refunding plan.

National Defense and the Cities

Second civilian defense bulletin issued; plans laid for civilian aircraft observation; health and housing efforts increased; living costs rise.

By DANIEL W. HOAN

Division of State and Local Cooperation
Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense

THE second bulletin on civilian defense, *Protective Construction,* has now been mailed by the Division of State and Local Coöperation to all state and local defense councils. In addition, it was sent directly to the chief executive officers of all municipalities of 1,500 or more in population.

This bulletin not only describes the various types of bombs used in recent aerial attacks abroad and the general effects of such bombs, but the measures of defense against aerial attack. It also discusses the protection of utilities and industrial plants, and the structural design and construction of air raid shelters.

While the bulletin will probably be of interest to some laymen, it is somewhat technical in character and is intended primarily for civilian and army engineers and others responsible for making plans. Issuance of the bulletin at this time is *not* a signal for starting work on the air raid shelters described.

Aircraft Observation Service

In accordance with a plan worked out with the general headquarters of the Army Air Corps, Mr. Frank Bane, director of the Division of State and Local Coöperation, recently sent informational letters to the state and local defense councils containing advice and instructions for registering suitable civilian volunteers for aircraft observation and warning service.

The civilian volunteers for such service are to be organized by the defense councils in time to begin operations in the Atlantic and Pacific coastal areas not later than June 15. Other areas of the nation-wide aircraft warning service will be organized shortly thereafter.

Steps to be taken by defense councils in registering volunteers and manning observation posts, filter centers, and information centers are outlined in *Aircraft Warning Series Bulletin No. 1,* issued on May 15 by the Division of State and Local Coöperation.

Observation posts spot aircraft. Men will be used for this outside duty. Inside service at filter and information centers is open to both men and women. Filter centers eliminate non-essential information. Essential reports are transmitted to information centers for plotting.

State defense councils have been asked to take three steps immediately: (1) They are to designate a member of the council to devote full time during the next thirty days to the program; (2) a planning committee is to be appointed; and (3) the officer and this committee are to develop at once a state-wide program of registration of volunteers.

To register volunteers for filter and information centers, state defense councils are urged to extend local defense council organization immediately to any unorganized sections of the state. Each state council and the state employment service will issue a joint instructional letter to local defense councils and local employment offices on the state's registration plan. Local defense councils, aided by local employment offices, are to plan local registration procedures at once.

If Soldiers Break the Law

The American Municipal Association has published and given wide distribution to a twenty-page pamphlet containing information designed to assist local officials in handling the problem of whether the civil or the military authorities have jurisdiction over soldiers or sailors running counter to the law. The publication is particularly valuable to localities adjacent to army training camps or navy posts. Civil authorities in these localities will, no doubt, be glad to familiarize themselves with the contents of this pamphlet and will find it helpful in solving problems that may arise.

Health Problems to the Fore

It is reported that 32 per cent of the draft registrants examined by draft board physicians are rejected because of physical or mental deficiencies. Of those who are passed, 12 per cent are later rejected by army doctors at the induction centers. Thus a total of 44 per cent are rejected.

This would indicate need for improvement and extension of public health programs, physical education in the schools that stresses bodily development rather than winning teams, and other steps to improve the health of the men, women, and children of the nation.

According to a survey of the International City Managers' Association the largest cities in the United States spent on an average approximately 35 per cent less per capita on health programs in 1940 than they spent in 1929, when expenditures were $1.19 per person. The highest 1940 expenditure shown on the survey, which included sixty-four cities of over one hundred thousand population, was $1.82 per capita, spent by a city with a public health program recognized as outstanding. The smallest amount spent was 14 cents per capita.

Leaders in the fields of medicine and public health, social work, nursing, home economics and nutrition, agriculture, education, labor, industry, government, and community organization met in Washington on May 26, 27, and 28, at the call of President Roosevelt, for the purpose of discussing the whole problem of health and nutrition as it relates to defense problems. It is expected that the conference will make recommendations to the President for an immediate program of action.

Apparently the federal government is tackling this problem in earnest. The question is will the municipalities do likewise?

Housing Survey to Be Made

A recent announcement by Defense Housing Coördinator Charles F. Palmer indicates that 58,542 housing units are now under construction contracts, and that additional construction approved by the President brings the total number of allocations for housing units to 87,260. Included in this construction are temporary shelters for defense workers and their families and demountable dormitories for single workers. Even trailers are called into use until better accommodations can be provided for families.

While private construction of housing has been on the increase, it is obvious from the figures quoted above that it has not kept pace with the demand.

It has also been announced that fifty-four additional offices will be opened by the Homes Registration Division "to survey and record every available room and house that could accommodate defense workers in the key industrial areas." The new offices,

in addition to thirty-four already operating, will coöperate with chambers of commerce, realtors, public health and welfare agencies. As in existing offices, clerical staffs and office help will be supplied by the WPA and NYA.

Urge Use of Subcontractors

City officials as well as private citizens are concerned with the question of whether every factory and every machine within the city boundaries is coöperating in the nation's productive efforts. A pamphlet on the defense contract service of the Office of Production Management tells manufacturers how to obtain information on defense contracts and subcontracts.

To get the defense program under way as rapidly as possible, most of the primary defense contracts went to the larger firms. Now every suitable factory in the country, large and small, must be enlisted.

Under date of May 3, Robert L. Mehornay, chief of defense contract service, sent a letter to each of the thirty-six field offices located in the federal reserve regions, stating in part as follows:

"Undoubtedly you have read President Roosevelt's letter to Mr. William S. Knudsen and Mr. Sidney Hillman urging an immediate acceleration of defense production and full utilization of available facilities. . . . It is essential that industry continue to increase the number of vital machines manufactured and that every single critical machine in the United States be used the maximum number of hours each week. Every effort should be made to utilize to the very limit those critical machines."

Sidney Hillman, associate director general of the Office of Production Management, has disclosed that the OPM, in conjunction with industrial leaders and committees representing the American Federation of Labor and the Congress for Industrial Organization, is laying plans for four-shift operation of key defense plants to secure 160 hours of consecutive operation out of the 168-hour week. Mr. Hillman went on to say that defense authorities are urging primary contractors to sublet contracts wherever possible, and that new defense contracts may contain specific provisions requiring the subletting of a certain percentage of the work.

These developments place a responsibility on the mayor, city manager, or local defense council to check into this subject to make certain that all idle plants and machines useful for defense work are placed in active service.

A movie on "Farming Out Defense Contracts" has just been released by the Office for Emergency Management. The film is available without cost to defense councils, civic organizations, community councils, veterans' groups, schools, and other organizations, upon application to the Information Division of the Office for Emergency Management.

Spiraling Prices and Wages

If every employer of labor realized that increases in the prices of commodities directly contribute to increased living costs which, in turn, often lead to demands for higher wages; if every employee appreciated the fact that increases in wages may be added to the price of the article he helped produce and may later buy in the retail market, thereby tending to raise the cost of his living generally, probably there would be less enthusiasm for boosting either prices or wages. It is like the cat turning around in a circle chasing its tail.

Such upward spirals are what Administrator Henderson, of the Office

of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, is trying to prevent. He has stated that this spiraling of prices and costs of living must be checked.

Recently Secretary of Labor Perkins announced that the cost of living in March was 2.6 per cent higher than in August 1939. Commissioner Lubin of the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported retail costs of food in large cities advanced 2.2 per cent between March 18 and April 15 in a general move throughout the country. Price rises were reported, for example, for fresh fruits and vegetables and such staples as flour, lard, butter, sugar, pork chops, and eggs. Retail prices of foods have shown moderate but steady advances since last November, and prices are now 5 per cent higher than last autumn and 4½ per cent higher than a year ago, but still lower than in 1937, Commissioner Lubin said.

Second Inter-American Congress of Municipalities

In the promotion of an inter-American Congress of municipal governments, municipalities of the United States have been represented, first, by the American Municipal Association, and later through the American Committee for the International Union of Local Authorities. This is a body made up of approximately eighteen representatives of the principal organizations of municipal officials and allied groups.

The first Congress was held in Havana, Cuba, in 1938. As was expected, a great deal of good was accomplished in promoting international good will and in demonstrating the value of local self-government.

Following the first Congress, the governing body has been able to increase the number of countries having national municipal leagues, or commissions to organize such leagues, from two to eighteen.

In order to make it possible for Canadian cities to affiliate, the name was changed recently from "Pan-American" to "Inter-American Congress of Municipalities."

Last month the writer was delegated by the President of the governing body of the Congress, Mayor Beruff of Havana, to attend the annual meeting of the Federation of Canadian Mayors and Municipalities, for the purpose of extending to them a formal invitation to participate in the Congress. He therefore joined the ten mayors from the United States, headed by Mayor LaGuardia, who flew to Ottawa on April 22 to attend the Canadian conference. The principal subject before the conference was "civilian defense."

Malcolm MacDonald, High Commissioner to Canada for the United Kingdom, addressed the conference and told of the very vital part the municipalities are playing in conducting civil defense in Great Britain.

Following the presentation of the invitation, a resolution was adopted by the Canadian federation endorsing the Inter-American Congress of Municipalities and urging that the federation endeavor to arrange for representation therein and that means be found to finance the trip.

The second Congress will be held in Santiago de Chile September 15-21, 1941. It is expected that several cities of the United States will see the wisdom of sending their chief executives to attend this Congress. They will do so not only because of increasing interest in seeing that a representative committee from this country attends the Congress, thus demonstrating a real interest in promoting good neighborliness, but also because of the publicity that will be given their cities throughout all the republics, particularly those in Central and South America.

The Researcher's Digest: June

Units of government in Texas; Boston and traffic; cooperation in defense research; what Hitler will do to Dayton; should the city go into business.

NO AMERICAN can ever talk about "the government" and be really intelligible. That is not so much because he may be governmentally illiterate but simply because he never has the simple fortune of living under a single government. Our system is blessed with such a multiplicity of governmental units, all operating upon the purse and surroundings of Mr. Average Citizen, that it would take a truly remarkable intelligence to encompass the activities of them all.

All of which is a lengthy way of leading up to *Units of Local Government in Texas*, a 221-page book which is the contribution of the **Bureau of Municipal Research of the University of Texas** to the simplification of the units of government problem. The bureau traces the various types of units in Texas back to their origins in the 1820's. Then present-day types and functions are discussed, with an analysis of trends and needs. And finally, the bureau presents the citizen with the compasses necessary for finding his way among the wildernesses of units which surround his own home. Fully two-thirds of the book are given over to lists and maps. If the Texan does not find at least a glimpse of the sun through his forest, assuredly it is not now the fault of the bureau.

State Aid for Traffic Relief

Local discussion of a nation-wide problem is contained in a recent *Bulletin* of the **Boston Municipal Research Bureau.** The bureau asks state aid for traffic relief in Boston, and announces that state, not local, bond issues should be used to cover arterial highway costs, provided there are safeguards against waste and extravagance. The bulletin outlines the history of Boston's traffic problem and presents in detail the proposed remedial program. Some of the "essential safeguards" presented include publicity, joint representation of the state and the city on a special authority, and a statutory brake on profits and land takings.

Pacific Defense Research

A plan for coöperation in making available to researchers in the Pacific southwest the fruits of one another's research on problems related to national defense is outlined in a recent bulletin of the **Western Governmental Research Association.** A questionnaire was sent to all the members of the WGRA to this end. The bulletin also describes the industrial resources survey of the Pacific southwest which is being conducted under the sponsorship of the National Resources Planning Board with the coöperation of the California State Planning Board.

"Competing with Business"

An argument to end arguments about the "city in business" is the theme of *Briefly—*, the May 16 bulletin of the **Kansas City Civic Research Institute.** Explains the bureau: "Outcry frequently is heard against the 'city going in business' or 'competing with private business,' when it is proposed that the city furnish for itself some service previously obtained through private sources." The bureau admits that in the case of specific projects there may be a real question of economic or public policy. However, it discards other arguments with an analogy: "If it is not 'proper' for the city to construct its own asphalt

plant—for its own uses, or to set up printing equipment—for its own uses, then why should not *all* government services be performed in this way? Why should not the city contract with private auditors to keep its books? . . . Clearly, this question is . . . a matter of efficiency and economy—how best to get a given job done."

Hitler Unimportant

A little homily on international affairs *cum* local affairs in the May 5 issue of the **Dayton Research Association's** *Facts* is most appropriate in this moment of international bewilderment. "The important thing is not what Hitler is going to do to Dayton," titles a discussion which maintains that the "more important thing is, what are the citizens of Dayton going to do to Dayton?" The bureau maintains that "it is folly for citizens to become so anxious to help mankind that they pass up the opportunity to preserve freedom at a minimum cost on Grand Avenue in Dayton, Ohio, in order to create freedom at a minimum cost thousands of miles away in Bagdad, Iraq." Nevertheless, the article continues, the locality must pitch into the national defense effort, and a seven-point program is presented, centering around the need for local economy.

Research Bureau Reports Received

Assessment

Analysis of Assessed Valuation of Land and Building in Detroit. Edited by J. R. Searles, prepared with cooperation of the WPA. Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc. (Report No. 157), February 1941. 98 pp.

Research

Research in the Social Sciences in Virginia's Colleges and Universities. *White Paper*, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia, 1941. 11 pp. mimeo.

Traffic

The $19,400,000 Street Program for Boston. *Bulletin,* Boston Municipal Research Bureau, April 28, 1941. 4 pp.

Units of Government

Units of Local Government in Texas. Bureau of Municipal Research, University of Texas (Municipal Studies No. 15), 1941. 221 pp.

CLEVELAND

(Continued from Page 340)

units being willing to give up their legal existence or any of their activities.

The numerous examples of coordinated activity pointed to in preceding pages constitute but a rather small fraction of the total governmental activity of the region. Aside from public utilities, welfare institutions, and police radio calls, coordination of effort receives scant attention. A major objection, raised particularly in connection with public utilities, is that only the central city has a voice in the administration of the service.

The obvious answer is that the Cleveland metropolitan area ought to be unified by annexation, or by centering certain activities such as planning, police and fire protection, and promotion of public health in one central agency representing and serving the entire region. Neither seems possible of achievement in the near future. Perhaps the Regional Association of Cleveland and the citizen committee now being organized may in time carry along the needed public education in regionalism sufficiently to make a solution possible.

Contributors in Review

ACTIVE on both the national and the local governmental scene, **James W. Fesler** (*North Carolina's Local Government Commission*) holds two appropriate posts at the present time—that of associate professor of political science at the University of North Carolina, and that of consultant to the National Resources Planning Board. He has in the past been a member of the staffs of the National Resources Committee and of the President's Committee on Administrative Management. Professor Fesler has held both Brookings and Rockefeller research fellowships.

THE only annual report issued by Cleveland since 1916 came out in 1939, a product of the pen of **Christian L. Larsen** (*Cleveland—Potential City of a Million*). Dr. Larsen is assistant professor of political science, specializing in local government and public administration, at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, where he has been for the past four years, ever since receiving his Ph.D. at the University of California.

SEMI-ANNUAL events in the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW are the municipal debt and tax tables of **Rosina Mohaupt** (*The Bonded Debt of 304 Cities as at January 1, 1941*), who continues as the statistician of the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research. Miss Mohaupt has done a manful share of work on taxation and other heretofore masculine research topics, and is responsible for several monographs published by the Detroit Bureau.

ANOTHER of the luminaries in the field of local government who has been drawn to Washington by the call of national defense is **Charles P. Taft** (*National Defense and Community Service*) who has been prominently identified with Cincinnati's municipal redemption. Councilman Taft is now assistant coordinator of all health, nutrition, and recreation activities affecting national defense, a position which permits him to reach down into the local scene from a new vantage point. He is author of *City Management—the Cincinnati Experiment.*

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

(Continued from Page 318)

techniques permit this at relatively low cost), dealing with one subject expressed in the simplest possible language, is far more effective than any attempt to cover the whole field of annual municipal operations.

If persistently pursued over a sufficiently long period, this method will tend to educate and stimulate the citizen, particularly if it is personalized as much as expense limitations permit. And after all, isn't money spent for such a worthy purpose wholly justified?

B. H. FAULKNER

Director, Department of Revenue and Finance
Montclair, New Jersey

News in Review

City, State, Nation
Edited by H. M. Olmsted

Two States Make Administrative Changes

Colorado and North Carolina assemblies adopt provisions which modify present set-up

THE state reorganization act just passed by the Colorado legislature, widely heralded as a great improvement in some quarters, is lacking in various important respects, according to Don C. Sowers, secretary-treasurer of the Colorado Municipal League. In a recent address, during Newspaper Week, Dr. Sowers said, in part:

"The administrative code of 1941 is not a sweeping reorganization measure. It incorporates very few of the recommendations of the Griffenhagen survey. It can most accurately be described as a reënactment of the code bill of 1933 with a few changes and improvements. It is, therefore, largely a paper reorganization as was the code bill of 1933.

"The important changes made are the following:

"1. The executive council is abolished and its functions are transferred to the governor and in its place is established a governor's advisory council.

"2. The governor is given control over all appointments in all departments and the number of employees must be approved by him. He may require the dismissal of employees in any department and in all these matters his decision is final and conclusive.

"3. A central revenue collection department is established. This is the most important administrative change made.

"Among the minor changes, the Division of Commerce, which includes the public utilities commission, state bank commissioner, insurance commissioner, and building and loan commissioner, is transferred from the Department of Law, headed by the attorney general, to the Executive Department under the governor.

Major Criticisms

"The major criticisms of the administrative code are that it does not provide an integrated and coördinated state organization, over which the governor can exercise real control, direction, and supervision. Within the eighteen divisions which constitute the executive department of which the governor is the head, there are no less than thirty-three independent and semi-independent state offices, boards, and commissions. Although normally responsible to the governor, in actual practice these agencies are continued as now organized without any change whatsoever in their legal or administrative structure.

"The code presents some major administrative difficulties in connection with the control of financial matters. It is not clear which department of government is to be responsible for the accounting and bookkeeping functions.

"The reorganization of the state machinery of governing constitutes just one-half of the job required to secure an economical and efficient administration. It is just as necessary to have competent people to staff and manage the organization as it is to have a sound organization. Although laws designed to improve the civil service system were introduced and considered, none were enacted. Until this is done the task is incomplete."

North Carolina Essays Reorganization

A general air of optimism prevailed in the 1941 session of the North Carolina legislature, and in consequence it distributed its largess with good will and dispatch.

In a term of only fifty-eight legislative days, the shortest since 1927, it increased appropriations and reduced taxes, provided substantial benefits for agriculture, improved the educational system, expanded pensions for public employees, increased state appropriations to units of local government, provided new legislative apportionments, and reorganized the state administration. Over 1,300 bills were introduced, and most of them were enacted into law.

The legislature passed two constitutional amendments which now will be submitted to popular referendum. The first involves judicial redistricting of the state, and the second provides for a state board of education replacing four present independent school agencies.

Administrative Reorganization

State administrative reorganization appears to be the result of a welter of motives in which reform in the interest of efficiency is only one. The constitutional amendment embodying the consolidation of several public school agencies provides for a board of education composed of one member appointed by the governor from each of the twelve congressional districts and the lieutenant governor, state treasurer, and superintendent of public instruction serving as ex-officio members. Submission of the amendment appears to result from public criticism of partisanship in the selection of an elementary state history textbook. The proposed amendment is considered by many still to be so political in nature that they believe it should be defeated at the polls.

The creation of many new agencies and commissions apparently stems from a desire to reward faithful party workers. The legislature bestowed on the newly-elected governor the greatest power of appointment ever possessed by a North Carolina executive. He is permitted to add twenty-five highway patrolmen. He is authorized to appoint commissions on state memorials, judicial redistricting, recodification of laws, problem of high school to college transition, practice code before quasi-judicial bodies, usury practices and laws, a state merit system, a unified merit system for employees paid in part by the federal government, new state buildings, establishment of a state nautical school, establishment of farm-trade schools, and consideration of aeronautics laws.

The elective office of utilities commissioner is transformed into an appointive board of three. The Motor Vehicle Department is reorganized, and a Tax Research Bureau is created. Three six-year, unexpired terms were abrogated by the legislature, and the governor was authorized to replace the incumbents with four-year appointees. It has been asserted that in other cases, such as the ABC and REA boards, resignations were obtained by mere threat to take similar action. Salary increments also had strong political implications.

E. A. M.

Merit System Gains in Two States; Loses in One

The New Mexico legislature has repealed the civil service system created in 1939 for seven state agencies and institutions; but the North Carolina and Vermont legislatures have recently enacted laws for advancement of the merit system, according to the Civil

Service Assembly of the United States and Canada.

The North Carolina law establishes a five-member merit system council to take over the work of three such councils that had been organized in compliance with the federal social security act to handle the recruitment and selection of personnel for the state agencies for unemployment compensation, health, welfare, and the blind. The legislature also authorized the governor, who has appointed the new council, to appoint a special commission to study the merit system.

The Vermont legislature empowered the governor to establish a classification and pay plan and to prescribe rules and regulations for a merit system of personnel administration; but no appropriation was made.

St. Louis to Vote on Merit System

Mayor Becker of St. Louis has announced that his administration will go ahead with an election scheduled for September 16, on a civil service charter amendment, in conformity with his campaign pledge. The Democratic aldermen who submitted the amendment and the new Republican members who ran on a platform calling for adoption of this reform both say they will regard it as "an administration measure."

Council Manager Plan News

A series of five bills to permit **Illinois** municipalities to select any one of four forms of government, introduced in the House of Representatives at Springfield on April 1, received a favorable vote—sixteen to nine—of the committee on municipalities on April 23; but on May 22, after amending the bills to exclude Chicago, the legislation was defeated in the house. The bills would make available to any Illinois city the city manager plan and the mayor-small-council plan, in addition to the commission and mayor-large-council plans which are now legal (the manager plan is at present limited to villages under 5,000 population). Proportional representation was optional under the bills. They were introduced at the request of the Illinois Council-Manager Conference and the City Manager Committee of Chicago, and have the backing of some two hundred civic and social groups. Governor Dwight Green has spoken in favor of city manager enabling legislation and Speaker Elmer Schnackenberg has worked for it.

A bill authorizing the manager plan in **Bar Harbor, Maine,** was adopted by the Maine legislature on April 25; a local referendum must be held prior to March 1942.

The village of **Windsor, Vermont,** which approved the manager plan in March, and the town of the same name, which had previously adopted the plan, will unite in selecting a manager for both.

A proposed manager plan for **Columbia, Pennsylvania,** has been endorsed by the merchants and other groups.

A bill to provide a town manager for **Smyrna, Delaware,** was passed unanimously by the State Senate.

Wise, Virginia, is expected to elect a new council June 10 and begin operation under the manager plan September 1.

Mayor V. L. Bjork of **Ishpeming, Michigan,** advanced the idea of council-manager government at a meeting of the Ishpeming Industrial Association on April 22, and a committee was named to make a thorough study of the plan.

The City Manager Charter Association of **Minneapolis, Minnesota,** has

been recently organized.[1] A proposed new city charter is in the hands of a research committee for study.

Burbank, California, which has had the manager plan for fourteen years, recently defeated charter amendments to abolish the plan by a three-to-one vote.

The council of **Palm Springs, California,** adopted the manager plan by ordinance, effective May 15.

Million-Vote Backing Fails to Help Penn. Home Rule

The present year has seen further efforts in Pennsylvania to secure enabling legislation and optional charters for cities under the home rule constitutional amendment which was approved nearly twenty years ago, in 1922, by a large majority of the electorate.

The home rule bill of 1939, which died in committee, has been redrafted in coöperation with the leaders of statewide citizens' organizations, and was introduced in the Senate during the first week of the present session of the legislature. The bill was referred to the Committee on Municipal Government for consideration and finally, on March 18, a public hearing was held at which representatives of more than one million Pennsylvanians endorsed the bill and asked for its passage.

At this hearing the only opponent of home rule was a spokesman for the League of Third Class Cities who opposed it on the grounds that the citizens in cities whose public officials were members of the league might decide by popular vote to change the present form of their local government. Although now he plead for the status quo, in 1922 representatives of the League of Third Class Cities campaigned throughout the state for home rule.

Finally, on April 29, the bill was reported out of committee, but with the principles of home rule destroyed by amendments which preserved the status quo for politicians and restricted the people in their effort to secure better public officials and more efficiency in public affairs.

The bill purports to permit Pennsylvania communities to draft new charters without legislative approval, but was changed to apply to only three cities—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Scranton—by eliminating reference to third-class cities, of which there are forty-six. It provides for the election of a charter commission to consist of fifteen from the majority party and ten from the minority party, with nominations at party primaries; whereas previously the commission was to consist of fifteen members, nominated by petition without party designation, and elected at the same time as the vote on the question of creating a commission, each elector to vote for ten. No new charter, or even amendments, are to be submitted at less than four-year intervals. The state election code must govern the election of officials under any charter, thus blocking proportional representation. Furthermore, a charter can deal only with "administrative affairs."

The bill was not discussed on the Senate floor at any time, but was again referred to the committee. Several further attempts have been made by interested citizens' groups to have the bill amended and reported out for passage. Thus far no action has been taken by the Senate.

In the meantime, a bill to consolidate the city and county of Philadelphia, a bill to eliminate county officials and consolidate their duties with the

[1] See "Snowdrifts Bury Old Charter; Minneapolis Seeks New One," p. 377 this issue.

city, and new charter bills for both Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have been introduced, adding to the confusion on the home rule issue.

Proponents of home rule and other legislation to improve state and municipal government in Pennsylvania are not discouraged although little constructive work has been done by the legislature.

SIDNEY B. DEXTER, *Chairman*
Committee on Legislation
The Committee of Seventy
Philadelphia

Police Administration in Seattle

Seattle is engaged in a spirited controversy over law enforcement policies of the past five years. The five-year term for police chief was voted by the people in 1936, changing from the old basis of police chief appointments by each incoming mayor, every two years. On May 1 the present chief was reappointed by the mayor for a second five-year term, over the protest of church, parent-teacher, and community organizations, and the Seattle Municipal League. The City Council plans a public hearing to air numerous complaints that have been registered concerning police administration.

Once approved by a majority of the council (five votes), the chief of police can be removed only by a three-fourths majority vote of the council (six votes), when requested to do so by the mayor for specific reasons, and following a public hearing.

EWEN C. DINGWALL
Seattle Municipal League

Growth of Supervised Public Recreation

More than 1,200 cities in the United States provide public playgrounds under leadership today, according to the National Recreation Association, compared with forty-one in 1906, when the association was organized. In reporting on its thirty-five years of activity, it gave the present number of supervised playgrounds as about 10,000, with 3,450 full-time and 21,500 part-time recreation leaders. There are 1,200 public swimming pools and 4,000 indoor recreation centers.

Nation's Growth Chiefly in Metropolitan Areas

The Bureau of the Census announces that 62,958,703 persons, or 47.8 per cent of the population of continental United States, live in 140 metropolitan districts. This is an increase of 8,205,058 for such areas in ten years, compared to 8,894,229 for the nation. For most of the larger cities the growth was faster in their entire metropolitan areas than within the cities proper.

Michigan Municipal Executives Graduate

For fourteen weeks twenty-two local administrators of the neighboring cities of St. Joseph, Benton Harbor, South Haven, and Niles, Michigan, met once a week to compare work experiences and discuss text materials of the International City Managers' Association correspondence course on the technique of municipal administration. They included city managers, finance officers, assessors, city attorneys, a police chief, and a city councilman. This was the first group training project built around this course. On April 22 the group held its "graduation" at St. Joseph; certificates were awarded the members by James W. Parry, state supervisor of public service training, who was one of the sponsors of the project. A similar training group is under the leadership of City Manager C. S. Johnson of Grand Rapids, and training activities for city officials have been undertaken in other parts of the state.

Post-Emergency Stabilization Plans

A three-billion-dollar program of municipal construction is under contemplation by the United States Conference of Mayors, it was stated on May 9 by Mayor LaGuardia of New York, president of the conference.

The program is not complete, and it has been suggested to President Roosevelt that $3,500,000 be provided for an inventory of desirable public projects, the construction of which would help to minimize the dislocation of industry and employment whenever the present defense effort may be drastically reduced.

County and Township

Edited by Elwyn A. Mauck

Manager Plan in Darlington County

Georgia legislature provides for manager appointed by Governor

EFFORTS to procure manager government in Darlington County, South Carolina, are being followed with considerable interest. The General Assembly on January 30 placed eight departments of Darlington County under the management of one official who was to be appointed by the county legislative delegation. On February 17 this plan was condemned by a mass meeting of local citizens as "dangerous and impractical," and an eight-man committee was appointed to confer with the local delegation in an effort to formulate an acceptable bill. Meanwhile the law was contested in the courts, and Circuit Judge J. Henry Johnson ruled that it was invalid because it violated the principle of separation of powers.

The office of county manager has since been created under an act which provides that a manager shall be appointed by the governor for a term of two years on recommendation of the county legislative delegation including the senator. An advisory commission of five members is likewise named by the governor on recommendation of the local delegation.

Public works of the county, including supervision and maintenance of all buildings and other public property, the construction, maintenance, and supervision of roads and bridges, and the supervision of the chain gang are placed under control of the manager. It is also his duty to purchase all equipment and supplies for the county, but "under such restrictions, rules, and regulations as to public advertisements, bidding, and opening and acceptance of bids, as may be promulgated by the Advisory Commission."

Since all past county government acts have been repealed, the departments of health, education, forestry, delinquent taxes, etc., are at present functioning under de facto officers. The legislature is now considering a bill which would make these various agencies directly responsible and responsive to the county manager.

It should be remarked that the action of the court in voiding the earlier enactment created considerable interest throughout South Carolina, inasmuch as county legislative delegations have by long established custom largely assumed the direction of county affairs. Incidentally, it should be added that this condition is being attacked by the women's organizations of the state. It was one of the subjects considered at a public forum sponsored in January by the Civic Club of Charleston. Since then it has been placed high on the agenda of the South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs by a recent meeting called to map out

a state-wide plan for conducting forums during the present year.

James K. Coleman
The Citadel
Charleston, South Carolina

County Reform Made Easier In New York State

Governor Lehman has signed a bill introduced by Senator Thomas C. Desmond and Assemblyman Lee B. Mailler which brings the optional county government law into conformity with the state's new constitution and thereby removes a major obstacle to the adoption of modernized county governments in the more populous counties outside of New York City.[1]

The original county home rule constitutional amendment passed in 1935 directed the legislature to make alternative forms of county government available for counties outside New York City (New York City having its own special county home rule provisions). In order to protect the towns and villages, the amendment provided that in any county having a city with more than a quarter of the county's population an alternative form could be adopted only by receiving a majority vote in such city and a separate majority in the rest of the county. This provision was known as the "split referendum."

Under this amendment the legislature passed three general laws making available a great variety of options for all counties outside New York City, and two special laws under which the suburban counties of Nassau and Westchester are now operating. In addition Monroe County, containing the city of Rochester, is operating under a general optional law that was enacted before passage of the amendment and which consequently limited the extent of reorganization. All four general laws contained the split referendum provision, although in three it was unnecessary repetition of the language of the constitution.

When the county home rule provision came up for reconsideration in the constitutional convention of 1938, the split referendum was opposed by many people in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Schenectady, and other cities on the ground that rural suspicion of any change advocated by the cities would make it impossible to get the required majority outside the major city even for a reorganization plan that left municipal powers intact.

On the other hand, representatives of the towns and villages complained that the split referendum did not afford them sufficient protection. As a compromise the convention provided that a simple county-wide majority vote was sufficient to adopt an alternative form which transferred no functions, but that any form including such a transfer must receive a majority vote in the class of municipalities from which, or to which, any function was transferred. The new constitution as adopted embraced this compromise.

The laws, however, still retained the split referendum as a requirement in addition to those prescribed by the constitution. The result was a combination of two sets of hurdles, but this now has been cured in two of the four general laws. The precedent was set last year when the "Fearon law" of optional county government was amended.

This year, on their third attempt, Senator Desmond and Assemblyman Mailler succeeded in amending the optional county government law they sponsored and saw enacted in 1937. This act is by far the most extensive of the four general laws in the range of options available both to county

[1]Ch. 190, L. of 1941.

government itself and to units within the county. It is, for example, the only law that allows proportional representation and preferential voting for county elections, and it is the only one that makes available a complete city-town-village-county consolidation.

Although the remaining two general laws still include the split referendum, the variety of options in the Desmond-Mailler law is such that almost any desired combination of provisions can be found under it. A proposal which seeks to modernize county government alone without encroaching on the smaller municipalities now will require simply a 10 per cent petition (or a resolution by the board of supervisors) and a county-wide majority vote. Any transfer of "powers, duties, or functions" will require the special majorities specified in the constitution and also, as formerly under the optional county government law, a separate majority in each city or large village before a power, duty or function can be taken from it.

G. H. H., Jr.

Citizens' Committee Studies Knoxville-Knox County

In August 1940, through funds raised by public subscription and supplemented by an appropriation from the Knoxville City Council, Griffenhagen and Associates were employed to make a survey of the governments of Knox County and the city of Knoxville. While a comprehensive survey of the city and county governments was originally contemplated, inability to raise sufficient funds necessitated making only preliminary or exploratory surveys of the two governments.

The Griffenhagen report on local government in the Knoxville-Knox County area was submitted to the joint survey committee in January of this year. Soon thereafter the Citizens' Advisory Committee was established to study the findings and recommendations set forth in the report and to formulate a program for the improvement of the two governments.

The report, in two volumes, has three parts: one deals with the government of Knox County, one with the government of the city of Knoxville, and the third with relationships between the two governments.

For the purpose of analyzing various sections of the report, the advisory committee has been divided into twelve subcommittees to deal with such matters as governmental organization, financial administration, health and welfare, education, public works, and city-county relationships. In addition a coördinating committee of four members has been created. This committee maintains contact with the various subcommittees, receives and reviews their reports, and submits its findings and recommendations to the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

The various subcommittees hold periodic meetings to study the report and to secure whatever additional information is deemed necessary to enable them to pass upon the recommendations embodied in it. City and county officials are invited to attend these committee meetings, and a number of local officials serve as advisory members.

The Citizens' Advisory Committee, consisting of approximately 125 members, holds monthly meetings, at which time the various subcommittees report on their activities. It also considers any committee reports submitted to it through the coördinating committee. The various committee reports, as changed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee in open discussion, will form the basis for final recommendations for improvement of the city and county government.

M. H. Satterfield
Tennessee Valley Authority

County Reform Asked by Milwaukee City Club

The Committee on County Affairs of the City Club of Milwaukee in a thirty-five page report issued recently[1] made the following recommendations:

"This committee recommends the adoption of enabling legislation including necessary constitutional amendments, which would permit the voters of Milwaukee County to reorganize the structure and activities of our county government so as to provide for:

"1. Election of a county board of nine at large by proportional representation for four-year terms;

"2. A county manager appointed by the county board and responsible to it for planning, directing, and coördinating the administration of county government;

"3. Abolition of the following as elective constitutional offices: county clerk, county treasurer, register of deeds, clerk of circuit court, sheriff, coroner, and county surveyor;

"4. Concentration of all administrative activities of county government in a limited number of departments, organized on the basis of function, including the following: public finance, public works, public welfare, public safety, public records, personnel, each department in charge of a director responsible to the county manager;

"5. Transfer of the functions of legal adviser and attorney for the county in all civil matters to the office of corporation counsel, an officer appointed by and responsible to the county board, and limiting the functions of the district attorney to those of public prosecutor;

"6. Appointment of the clerk of each court by the judge or judges of such court;

"7. A county auditor, appointed by and responsible to the county board.

"The committee recommends further, as a means of arousing public interest in the improvement of county government, the creation by the Wisconsin legislature of a special commission on county government to be appointed by the governor of the state, to study and report on the condition of county government in Wisconsin and draft proposals for improving its efficiency."

Independent Grand Juries Opposed in Washington State

A state-wide effort is under way to block grand jury reforms, passed by the Washington state legislature, through a door-to-door campaign for signatures on referendum petitions which would delay effectiveness of the new laws until the general election in November 1942.

Amendments approved by the legislature provide for independent grand juries, served by special prosecutors appointed by the judges of the Superior Court, with the county prosecuting attorney barred from taking any part in the proceedings. The State Association of County Prosecutors is on record formally objecting to the changes. Unless proponents of the referendum measure obtain 30,000 valid signatures before June 11, however, the new laws will go into effect.

The Seattle Municipal League, in opposing the referendum campaign, emphasized the need for completely independent grand juries, functioning entirely apart from the control or influence of the prosecuting attorney.

Ewen C. Dingwall
Seattle Municipal League

---

[1] *Reorganization of Milwaukee County Government,* January 1941.

Citizen Action

Edited by Elwood N. Thompson

Roundup—

AS LOCAL communities feel the impact of the defense program to an increasing extent, there is a growing awareness of the need for some kind of community coördination to meet the problems created by that program . . . **Community councils** seem to be the best solution developed so far, and there are now, in addition to the **National Municipal League,** some fifteen national groups, including citizen organizations and government agencies, which can provide information or guidance to groups interested in establishing councils. Let us know if you need help.

Under the auspices of the **American Association for Adult Education,** adult education councils have been organized in a number of communities. . . . One of the most outstanding jobs has been done by the **Council of Metropolitan Cincinnati,** which this year sponsored a highly successful "Leader's Institute in Group Discussion for Strengthening Democracy." Anyone interested in obtaining a complete outline of the procedures followed in planning and holding this institute as well as in their follow-up should write to the council, 629 Vine Street, Cincinnati.

May seems to be the popular convention month for citizen organizations. . . . The **American Association of University Women** met in Cincinnati May 5-9, and the **National Congress of Teachers** in Boston May 19-22. . . . This is not a convention year for the **National League of Women Voters,** but the National League Council gathered in Washington May 6, 7, and 8. Later in the month most of the **State Leagues** held their annual meetings to hear reports from their delegates to the National Council and to act on state programs for next year.

We have recently seen a copy of the plan of work for 1940-1943 of the **Committee on Citizenship of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.** It includes a recommendation that local parent-teacher associations would do well to encourage formation of coördinating councils in communities where they do not exist and also describes briefly the so-called Manitowoc Plan or "Induction into Citizenship" movement. . . . These are two projects which we have long felt to be worthwhile; either of them is suitable for application in almost any community.

The **Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations,** in support of its bill providing civil service standing for county employees, has issued one of the most effective promotion pieces we've seen in some time. It's colorful, direct, easy to read, and to the point—in fact, full of suggestions for any group sponsoring merit system legislation.

Municipal movies are becoming an increasingly popular way for cities to tell their citizens about what they are doing. And the citizens seem to like it. In Atlanta and Chicago, for example, municipal films are substituted for shorts in local theatres. . . . We think it would be well worth while and meet with widespread support if citizen organizations looking for suitable projects would investigate the possibility of having such films produced in their own communities.

Cleveland, Ohio, was one of the early cities to use the radio as a means of informing the public about the city government. The May 1 issue of *Greater Cleveland,* bulletin of the **Citizens League,** is devoted to a detailed discussion of the kinds of programs which have been put on by the various city departments. . . . This bulletin contains

ideas which should be useful to citizen organizations which want to sponsor their own radio programs on civic subjects or to those who would like to be able to suggest to their local governments a greater variety of ways in which they might employ the radio.

"Easy-chair citizenship" affects too many people these days, says the **Seattle Municipal League** in its current membership campaign literature. The league maintains that voting on election day, important as it is, is not enough. Always in step with the times, the league calls its members "Seattle's Army for Good Government" and has adopted military terms as follows: a colonel for a member who helps in securing fifteen new members; a captain for one who helps in recruiting from five to nine new members, etc.

R. M. W.

New York Women's City Club Celebrates Silver Anniversary

In May the Women's City Club of New York celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. While organizations of men dedicated to the task of improving local governments were common a quarter of a century ago, women had not as yet received the vote in this country and there was, therefore, little opportunity for them to express an opinion in municipal or, in fact, any governmental affairs.

With the granting of suffrage to women, however, the way was opened for their participation in public affairs. A study of the past accomplishments of this organization and its program for the future makes suggestive reading for those who today are asking themselves what can be done to strengthen the defense of democracy.

The club has consistently confined its activities to the affairs of the City of New York and takes action on state or federal legislation only when such legislation has a direct bearing on either the government of the city or the welfare of its citizens. For example, the club supported the public housing program which necessitated passage of both state and federal legislation. More recently, it has been urging the Women's Bureau in the United States Department of Labor to undertake a study of the household employment situation throughout the country. The first was of vital concern to slum dwellers in the city and the second of equal importance to a large group of women workers for whom comparatively little has been done in the regulation of hours, in social security, or in unemployment or workmen's compensation insurance.

The work of the club is carried on by seven civic committees: city affairs, education, public health, housing, labor and industry, prevention and correction, and civil liberties. Membership in these committees is open to any member who has interest in the subject and is willing to give time to meetings, study, and research.

A glance at some of the achievements will give an idea of the scope of the club's activities.

> Financing and operation of first maternity center in New York City—1918—which in May 1920 became a separate entity, and today is a national organization;
>
> Blocking of the attempt of the federal government to establish a naval aviation station on city-owned Jacob Riis Park at Far Rockaway—1921;
>
> Study and report on tenement home work in New York City—1919;
>
> Study of dance halls in New York City—1924—and tightening of licensing and supervision of same;
>
> Study of the delinquent negro child—1927;
>
> Study of child and youthful marriages in New York County—legislation prohibiting child marriages and requiring parents' and judges' consent in marriage of minors—1929;
>
> Study of "Housing for the Family" the report of which has

been used extensively throughout the country in the development of the public housing program—1935;

Study of comfort stations in New York City—1933—copies of this report have been distributed throughout this country as well as in many foreign countries;

Study of truancy and probationary schools—1934-35;

Publication of primer on proportional representation method of voting—1936;

Publication of primer on "Topsy Transit"—1937—showing how New York's complicated transit system grew and the importance of transit unification.

But the Women's City Club is not an organization that looks backward, and on the occasion of its recent anniversary it presented a program for future govenment in New York City, not only for the coming mayoralty campaign but one for several future campaigns.

Included in this program are the eventual adoption of the city manager form of government; a complete overhauling of the present tax structure of the city including taxes shared by the state; and complete reorganization of the archaic county government.

It is in the field of education, health, and social welfare, however, that women show the deepest concern. The club is urging careful studies and eventual reorganization of both the Board of Education, which is responsible for the administration of the elementary, junior, and senior high schools, and the Board of Higher Education, which is responsible for the four city colleges. In the opinion of the club, New York City is not getting the kind of education it wants for the city's children and it anticipates the day when parents will move into New York City because of the educational opportunities for their children, rather than out of it because of the lack of such opportunities.

The health of the nation is of paramount importance today as the backbone of defense. The club urges extension of the Astoria health program to all the cities' schools, even though this entails doubling the number of doctors and nurses for school service. A corollary of this program requires periodic health and psychological check-ups for every school teacher, and at least one course in public health for every teacher.

The club is convinced that henceforth the emphasis must be on adequate personnel to staff the city's hospitals, health centers, and laboratories. There is a similar need of additional trained personnel in the social services connected with the courts. The club urges expansion of the Juvenile Aid Bureau of the Police Department and clearance through that bureau of all children taken into custody. They advocate that the city provide its own shelters for such children as soon as practicable, instead of relying on private shelters which refuse public inspection.

These planks taken from the club's platform illustrate how a group of women can serve their community by educating themselves and influencing public opinion through their organization. In a small way it may help to give our democratic form of government a chance for survival and expansion.

JULIET M. BARTLETT, *Secretary*
Women's City Club of New York

Snowdrifts Bury Old Charter; Minneapolis Seeks New One

The worst snowstorm in many years of its history hit Minneapolis on Armistice Day 1940. Many lives were lost; drifts were piled high; transportation came to a virtual standstill; street cars were unable to move; and motorists were forced to abandon their cars. Taxi drivers wouldn't venture beyond the immediate loop.

Minneapolis is in a belt where snow is a bountiful crop. Every winter sees at least one big snow—sometimes a blizzard. But never had a snowstorm so handicapped a city as did this one.

The city was many days digging itself out. Many streets went unplowed for a week. Sidewalks were left to the householders to clean. Even main thoroughfares were almost impassable.

Minneapolis began to wonder. Where was its government in this emergency? What was being done with its taxes? The city engineer's office was busy all day long explaining why things weren't being done—lack of funds—can't get out there—can't help it. Why wasn't something being done? Its neighbor, St. Paul, was getting the job done quickly.

The answer was simple. A horse-and-buggy-day government, complacent in its hodge-podge of politics, with its numerous politicians ready to pledge anything but passing the buck whenever called upon to produce, was responsible.

The old-fashioned city government hadn't prepared for this snow. It hadn't appropriated necessary funds. Equipment was not where it should have been. Handshaking, backslapping aldermen—twenty-six of them—had forgotten that Minneapolis does have snowstorms. The story was repeated again a few weeks later with another heavy snow.

Minneapolis has been dissatisfied with its form of government for years, but never had it seen the outmoded government fail to operate as it did during these emergencies. The city looked askance at the organization and cast about for something new—something that would eschew politics and be prepared to operate when it was needed.

Public-spirited citizens are undertaking to provide the answer—as set up in the city manager form of government. Efforts had been made in the past to amend the charter and shave off some of the excess in the city hall but without success. A number of citizens have now joined in and are trying to convey the picture to the voters. Mrs. Arnulf Ueland, active in women's affairs, is president of the City Manager Charter Association; George F. Williamson, an attorney, is its vice-president; Marshall B. Taft, another young lawyer, is its treasurer. Well known citizens of all political interests compose the board of directors. Professor William Anderson, head of the University of Minnesota Political Science Department and a nationally known authority on municipal government, is chairman of the research committee that will prepare the new charter.

Already a rough draft of the proposal has been submitted by a Minneapolis expert on municipal government, Ben W. Palmer. In brief, it provides for a council of nine members to replace the current twenty-six. The council will elect the mayor from its own members and select a city manager who will be responsible for operation of all administrative activities. The proposed charter provides also for retention of the civil service principle.

The new organization, with headquarters at 224-226 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, got under way in February. It was incorporated and started its campaign May 1. The plan is to raise a nominal budget of $12,400 in a drive to be terminated July 1, following which the organization will complete preparation of the charter which it will submit.

The campaign to educate the voters to the new form of government will get under way September 1. The proposed charter will come before them for their vote at the state primary election in September 1942.

HAROLD N. FALK, *Secretary*
Minneapolis City Manager
Charter Association, Inc.

Organized Campaign Brings Indiana Home Rule Victory

With the passage of a home rule amendment to the constitution by the 1941 Indiana legislature, the strong Home Rule Committee, organized through the efforts of the state Junior Chamber of Commerce, has seen the successful conclusion of the first steps necessary to secure home rule for Indiana cities.

Since 1905 all cities in the state have operated under the cities and towns act which permits only one form of government—the mayor-council plan.

A movement for adoption of optional forms of government culminated in the securing of such legislation in 1921; but discovery that the act did not fit the complicated structure of existing city government led to the adoption of extensive amendments in 1929.

Acting under the optional law Indianapolis adopted the manager plan in 1927 by a vote of six to one, but a successful suit to test the validity of the act halted its use before the new plan actually went into effect. The attack was not on a broad constitutional ground, but it was effective and the law was held invalid.[1] This bitter defeat on a narrow and strained construction effectively halted the manager movement in Indiana for nearly ten years.

Many organizations in Indiana favored the city manager plan of government for years before the present state-wide movement got under way. Among these were the Indiana League of Women Voters, the State Chamber of Commerce, and the Indiana League of Civic Associations. One of the major newspapers of the state—the *Indianapolis News*—long had carried city management as the first plank of its platform. However, no organization adopted the program as its major objective. The movement lacked leadership until the Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce, at its convention in 1937, determined to press the program.

A committee of young men set out to study plans. Much support was tendered. In the legislative session of 1939, the first held after the 1937 convention, the 1921 optional manager law, with the 1929 amendments and some other modifications, was introduced by a senator hoping to ride the crest of the demand for manager government.

The studies of the Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce committee, after counselling with John W. Esterline of Indianapolis and other leaders in the original movement, convinced the committee that any city manager plan to be effective must have a degree of permanence. An act subject to repeal or modification by every successive legislature, regardless of whether charters were or were not adopted under it, could afford no permanence.

Adoption of an amendment to the constitution was the way to obtain permanence. A resolution, providing for the establishment of a commission to study and draft an amendment was prepared and introduced. Support was given to this resolution rather than to the manager bills, and the bills were defeated and the commission set up.[2]

The commission spent nearly two years in study, and prepared a carefully drawn amendment for the constitution with a supporting report.[3]

In the meantime, the Indiana Junior

[1] See *Keane v. Remy* (September 24, 1929), 201 Ind. 286, where the court held the law unconstitutional on the narrow ground that the clerk could not physically verify the signatures on a petition within the time allotted by statute. The court disregarded the right of the clerk to use deputies, which had actually been done, and also the certification which had been made.

[2] See also NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW for November 1939, p. 802.

[3] See NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW for October 1940, p. 638.

Chamber of Commerce organized for the anticipated fight in the legislature by establishing the Home Rule Amendment Committee. The committee secured adequate funds from leading citizens of the state, and proceeded with the groundwork for the 1941 legislative session.

Long in advance of the primary election, the committee determined to contact all candidates prior to the election, to furnish them with copies of the commission's report and acquaint them generally with the interest in the proposed home rule movement. A one-day school was held at Indianapolis with about sixty-five persons, consisting primarily of young men who were to be trained for the problem of contacting three hundred legislative candidates. The school gave instruction by the members of the commission as to the character and content of the amendment, by persons versed in municipal law as to the operation of the amendment if adopted, and by legislators as to the best method of approaching a candidate for support.

This group accepted assignment of cards for every legislative candidate, and prior to the general election all but a small percentage of the candidates, as well as the candidates for governor, had been personally interviewed and furnished with a copy of the commission's report and acquainted with the home rule objectives.

A subsequent training school was held for the instruction of speakers, and some twenty-five persons participated in a day's training. A speakers' bureau was established through which speakers from the Home Rule Amendment Committee made talks in every part of the state.

As the legislative session approached, an active working subcommittee was placed in charge, and a young man obtained and registered as a lobbyist for the amendment.

The amendment as submitted was self-executing, no legislative act being required for the adoption of a charter under it. It was also broad enough to permit the establishment of any kind of charter—city manager, mayor-council, commission, or otherwise. No real opposition developed except in the Senate which disputed the self-executing feature.

The amendment, with the self-executing clause eliminated, passed both the Senate and House and was signed by the Governor. The fight, however, is not successfully concluded because the amendment must also pass the next session of the legislature in 1943, and be adopted by a majority of the voters of the state at a general election.

The Home Rule Amendment Committee is now girding itself for this effort. Its speakers' bureau is being continued and enlarged, its plan for acquainting legislators with the amendment will operate again, and through coöperation of local organizations there will undoubtedly be a clear and strong expression of public sentiment for passage of the amendment at the next session of the legislature.

The amendment will provide permanence to any city charter adopted because it restricts the legislature in modifying or repealing any enabling act as to charters in existence. Enabling legislation must be adopted after the amendment becomes law, however, in order to put home rule in motion.

Many of the leading citizens of the state have recognized that it will take long and arduous effort to bring about the final result, but they have willingly cast their lot with the Home Rule Amendment Committee because they consider it worthwhile.

HARRY T. ICE
Indiana Junior Chamber of Commerce

Taxation and Finance
Edited by Wade S. Smith

Chicago Survey Reduces Costs

Two citizen groups report on constructive results obtained; additional surveys planned

CHICAGO'S coöperative survey to reduce expenditures and improve administration has borne important fruits in the little more than a year since it got under way. The city's operating budget for 1941 has been measurably reduced as a consequence of the adoption of survey recommendations, and similar surveys are in prospect for other Chicago governmental units.

This is indicated in an interim report[1] just published by the Chicago Association of Commerce and the Chicago Civic Federation, which jointly sponsored the survey. The "more important, immediate, and tangible" results of the survey are summarized in the report as follows:

1. A reduction of at least 305 positions, including elimination of an entire department, and salary reductions totaling $937,637;

2. Constructive assistance to the city administration in its action in reducing the total city appropriation for 1941 by some $2,000,000;

3. Action by the City Council looking toward complete review of position classifications and wage scales in the city government;

4. Provision by the City Council for a fiscal audit.

An interesting feature of the survey, which disclosed that the civil service system in Chicago "has persistently failed to function actively," was the tabulation of service classifications and rates of pay in a large number of private enterprises in the city for comparison with those in the city service. It revealed rates of pay in the city service in some cases double those in private employment for like work, as well as wide divergence within the city service itself for comparable positions. The consequent deterioration in employee morale and lack of recruitment of desirable new employees was found to be one of the most important problems facing the city.

An interesting feature of the survey organization is the coöperation secured between the sponsoring civic organizations and the city administration. The survey was first seriously considered in April 1939, when Mayor Kelley conferred with Civic Federation representatives concerning means of alleviating the fiscal difficulties of the city's corporate (general operating) fund. Early in 1940 ways and means were found of financing a survey to develop possibilities of economies which would permit progressive reduction of the city's operating deficit, and in March 1940, the city council appointed a Budget Survey Committee to coöperate in the survey.

This committee consisted of Frank J. Flanagan, chairman of the council finance committee and city budget examiner; Oscar E. Hewitt, commissioner of public works; Robert B. Upham, city comptroller; and Graham Aldis, president of the Civic Federation and representative of the Chicago Association of Commerce. The survey was actively directed by the Civic Federation's executive secretary, Douglas Sutherland, using a technical staff financed by the Association of Commerce. Working space was provided by the city in the City Hall.

[1] *An Administrative Survey of the City of Chicago* (1941).

Inasmuch as Chicago has been much criticized for its administrative inefficiency, spoils politics, and fiscal difficulties, the success shown thus far is both significant and heartening. Moreover, present results are not to be the full measure of the survey's effectiveness. Already a survey has been requested by the Chicago Sanitary District, and has been begun, while a similar survey has been requested by the Chicago Board of Education. An intensive survey of the Cook County tax collector's office has been going on for some time, with procedural changes effected and experimental efforts still going forward to find a satisfactory way of liquidating the community's gigantic accumulation of unpaid property taxes.

All in all, it looks very much as though Chicago were at last waking up to the fact that its problems are susceptible of solution if attacked with vigor and determination.

Trend of Public Debt Reviewed by Census Bureau

At June 30, 1940, the public debt of the United States and its local subdivisions was $63,196,000,000. Of this total $42,971,000,000 was the responsibility of the federal government, $16,720,000,000 of the local units, and $3,505,000,000 of the states. While the total compared with $39,049,000,000 in 1932, the local share alone was only $39,000,000 above 1932 while the state share was up $623,000,000. Whereas in 1932 the local portion accounted for 42.7 per cent of the total, in 1940 it accounted for but 26.5 per cent. The federal government's share, 49.9 per cent of the total in 1932, had increased to 68.0 per cent by 1940.

These facts are revealed in a recent study of the Bureau of the Census,[1] prepared under the direction of C. E. Rightor, chief statistician for state and local government. Dr. Wylie Kilpatrick, technical assistant to Mr. Rightor, compiled and analyzed the data with the assistance of staff members and wrote the text, while Lynden Mannen of the division of tax research of the Treasury Department collaborated in the study. The planographed volume of seventy-nine pages includes material invaluable to those working in the field of municipal research and local government administration. The voluminous tables contain detailed data for the states, counties of over 50,000 population, and cities of over 30,000 population.

The study is the first nation-wide report to analyze state and local public debt according to the character of the obligation. It shows that of the total long-term state and local public debt, $16,672,000,000, or 86.2 per cent, consist of general obligation bonds (that is, bonds for which the full taxing power of the issuing unit is pledged). An additional $1,778,000,000 or 9.2 per cent are revenue bonds (obligations payable exclusively from the revenues of specified enterprises) and $880,000,000, or 4.6 per cent of the total, are special assessment obligations. The latter type of obligation, which has been extremely troublesome in many localities, is found to have declined over 52 per cent since 1932. The obligations paid from earnings of special enterprises (mostly municipal water and electric power utilities) account, of course, for a much larger amount than the revenue bonds alone. While figures on this type of debt could not be secured in total, it is notable that the public service enterprise debt of cities of over 100,000 population was $3,189,000,000 in 1940, or 44 per cent of their total obligations.

The local debt movement from 1932 to 1940, which was marked by retire-

[1] *State and Local Government Debt: 1940.*

ments almost sufficient to offset new issues during the period, was of course in sharp contrast to the situation during the two preceding decades. Local debt was estimated at less than $2,000,000,000 in 1902, at $4,075,000,000 in 1912, and at $9,092,000,000 in 1922. In 1912 local debt accounted for 71.6 per cent of the estimated aggregate federal, state, and local total, however, comparing with $423,000,000 for the states and $1,194,000,000 for the federal government.

In connection with the sharp and well known rise in federal debt, the study notes the conclusions of the National Income Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce that between 1929 and 1939 private net debt in the nation declined $21,744,000,000, more than offsetting the rise in public net debt from $28,946,000,000 to $50,804,000,000 between these years. Thus the past decade appears to have seen a check not only in the rise of local debt but in the rise of total public and private net debt.

Louisville Award to Gibson of Portland

The first annual "Louisville Award" of the Municipal Finance Officers' Association of the United States and Canada was presented at the banquet concluding its annual convention on May 22 to City Auditor Will E. Gibson, of Portland, Oregon. The award is for the most outstanding service by a municipal or other public finance officer during 1940, and bears the name of the city which last year established the fund. Louisville was also the host to the convention on the occasion of the first award.

Mr. Gibson has been city auditor of Portland since November 1938 and formerly was county auditor of Multnomah County. He was presented with the award for his outstanding work in revising the accounting system of his department. The revision included the installation of an accrual accounting system which will permit the city to prepare balance sheets for the first time in its history, but an extremely interesting phase of the job included the setting up by Mr. Gibson of detailed work plans for each phase of the department's activities. The resulting work manual contains a set of specifications which will insure continuity of work in the department and greatly facilitates the training of employees.

Certificates of merit and honorable mention were given at the same time to Julian W. Deshaies, city auditor of Lewiston, Maine; Charles J. Fox, city auditor of Boston, Massachusetts; Walter C. Peterson, city clerk of Los Angeles, California; A. E. Neale, city auditor of Springfield, Massachusetts; Wm. "Scotty" Jack, state auditor of Wyoming; and John J. Schiedel, secretary of the school district of the township of Upper Darby, Pennsylvania.

The award was made by a committee of judges consisting of George Price Ellis, of Chicago, past president of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants and past president of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce; Neville Miller, former mayor of Louisville, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters; and Frederick L. Bird, director of municipal research for Dun and Bradstreet. Dr. Bird, incidentally, was named an honorary member of the association at the meeting, bringing the roster of honorary members to three.

In considering applications for the award, the judges required that each accomplishment be equal to the best standards in current practice. They also considered the amount of original thinking necessary, the degree of cooperation required with other governmental agencies or other governmental

departments, the value to the public at large of the accomplishment, and the value to the governmental unit involved considering its size, nature, and complexity. The applications submitted for the award were twenty-one in number, ranging from coast to coast and from north to south. It is expected that this annual award will bring to light and stimulate the constructive work being done by the finance and accounting officers of states, counties, cities and other local governments.

Each year a gold medal and parchment certificate will be given the winner and certificates of merit and honorable mention will be given to those whose services are outstanding.

Minnesota Reports on Finances of Local Units

The public examiner of the state of Minnesota recently released a summary report of the revenues, expenditures, and debt of the state and local governments for the year 1938. This report will be followed by a more detailed report giving this information for each of the local units throughout the state for which information was available.

These reports are the first results of the new activity—state reporting of local financial statistics—instituted by this department under the statutory direction contained in the so-called Minnesota reorganization act enacted by the 1939 state legislature.

The only reports of this nature which were formerly available in Minnesota have been incomplete, both as to the financial transactions included and as to the classes of local units covered. The Department of Education has published biennially a fairly complete report on the financial transactions of the seven thousand school districts within the state. Information as to assessed valuations, tax levies, and debts of other local units has been included in reports of the Department of Taxation.

A growing recognition of the need for accurate and comparable information as to the revenues, expenditures, and other financial transactions of all classes of local units led to the enactment of the statute directing the public examiner to collect such information in coöperation with local officials and to make a report as to his findings.

Unfortunately, no legislative appropriation was made to carry on the activity at the time the law was enacted. A study of local finance in Minnesota for the year 1937, however, had been made by the Work Projects Administration and sponsored by the Minnesota Resources Commission through its Committee on Governmental Finance. In the fall of 1939 the public examiner joined with this committee as co-sponsor for the collection of financial statistics of local governmental units for the year 1938. Thus the activity was initiated. Federal approval of a continuation of this project for the year 1939 has already been secured and legislative appropriations to the Department of Public Examiner will permit the continuation of this activity during the biennium of 1941-43.

Report forms were devised by the public examiner and sent to some 750 cities and villages and 1,900 towns within the state. Financial information from the eighty-seven counties and the state itself was secured from the audit reports of the department and the school district statistics were secured from the Department of Education. It is interesting to note that the first report covers approximately 95 per cent of all local units, although no effort was made to force compliance with the law. The coöperation received from all classes of local officials was excellent.

While the statistical purposes of the

report are important from a standpoint of community comparison and in developing state-wide information, the constructive use of the reporting activity as a means of improving local accounting and budgeting methods has been and will be even more important. Even after only two years of operation, considerable interest in improving their present accounting and budgeting procedures has been evidenced by local finance officers as a result of the educational aspects of the activity.

WILLIAM H. SHERMAN
Department of Public Examiner
State of Minnesota

Public Reporting

An interim public report of note is *Quarterly Progress,* the quarterly municipal and financial report of the city of Jackson, Mississippi, population 62,107. An attractively printed volume issued by the city auditor, Mr. V. E. McGowen, this little report is a model of its kind. The issue for the quarter ending March 31, 1941, of forty-eight pages, contains excellent illustrations of current developments in the city, vividly written and highly informative spot-news stories on pending governmental and community problems, eleven pages of financial statistics which include balance sheets as well as debt and tax data, and a number of brief "letters to the citizens" posing matters of city policy on which an expression of opinion is asked. The city has the commission form of government. Its annual financial report is also of above-average quality.

The annual report of City Auditor W. H. McNichols, of the city and county of Denver, contains a good discussion of the city's past policy of issuing bonds. Past issues, while serial, have had initial maturities deferred ten to sixteen years, costly in point of total interest to be paid.

Proportional Representation

By George H. Hallett, Jr.

(This department is successor to the Proportional Representation Review)

P. R. Authorized for Boston

Another Illinois Defeat An Object Lesson in Alberta

ON JUNE 2 Governor Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts signed the bill permitting Boston to adopt P.R. for its city council. A campaign for actual adoption is being planned for next year.

The bill was advanced to third reading in the House of Representatives by 119 votes to 88 with the active assistance of Speaker Christian A. Herter, who left the chair to speak on its behalf. Then, on May 13, it passed third reading by 110 votes to 92.

The bill then went to the Senate, where on May 20 it was passed finally by the narrow margin of 17 to 16. Fourteen Republicans and three Democrats voted for the measure and four Republicans and twelve Democrats (including the representatives of the dominant Democratic organization of Boston) voted against it. Motions in both houses to reconsider were defeated.

Boston now has the same right as other cities in Massachusetts to adopt P.R. for its city council by petition and popular vote without an accompanying change to the city manager plan. The "Plan E" law, under which Cambridge is to elect its council by P.R. for the first time this fall and choose its first city manager in January, was not affected by the bill and will still exclude Boston from its scope. Boston already had the option to elect its school committee by P.R. and its mayor by the corresponding Hare system of majority preferential voting.

The *Boston Herald,* referring editori-

ally on May 10 to the hurdles still to be surmounted before P.R. becomes a reality in Boston (after passage of the bill, circulation of a petition, and popular approval at the polls), concluded:

> Nevertheless, it should not discourage those citizens who want Boston to achieve a better, fairer, and more effective technique of self-government. We have tried electing councilors at large and electing them, as at present, by wards, and the results have been equally disappointing.

On May 17 the *Christian Science Monitor* carried the following editorial:

> *"PR" for Boston*
>
> Should the people of Boston be allowed to decide how they shall choose their City Council? That is the major issue in the pending legislative measure which would permit a referendum in Boston on adoption of the proportional representation system, if 10 per cent of the voters should petition for it.
>
> The present Council, by a vote of seventeen to one, registered its opposition to the bill and to "PR" in general. Several who spoke asserted "PR" is "hard to understand." Yet the newsboys of the Burroughs Foundation used it successfully in electing officers some time ago. Others charged that "PR" brings "minority rule." Yet under the present plurality system twelve of the present twenty-two councilors were elected by a minority of those actually voting in their wards!
>
> The councilors object that "PR" would "destroy the last vestiges of representative government." Yet the system has greatly improved local government in Cincinnati and New York City and is used successfully in Eire.
>
> Proportional representation gives every group in the population representation in proportion to its voting strength. Because of the intrinsic merit of "PR" and because Bostonians should have opportunity to choose "PR" if they want it just as do citizens of other Bay State communities, the legislature would do well to act favorably on the bill.

Illinois Bills Lose Again

Bills to permit Illinois cities and villages to adopt the manager plan of government and to couple proportional representation with it if they wished received serious consideration again in this year's Illinois House of Representatives, but once more failed to pass. A favorable committee report was followed by rejection on May 13, by 72 votes to 54, of a motion to kill the bill by striking out the enacting clause. At that point the prospects looked bright, for a House majority seemed assured and Governor Green was openly in favor. But on May 22 an amendment was carried *viva voce* to exclude Chicago from the scope of the proposal, after a proposal to table it had been beaten 74 to 60, and then, since a large part of the interest centered in Chicago, the whole proposal was killed by striking out the enacting clause on a voice vote without a roll call. A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate and could still be passed if there should be a change in the legislative alignment.

Two Systems Compared in Alberta

Complete figures recently received for the election of the Alberta legislature held on March 21, 1940, bring out the usual contrast between the results of the "alternative vote" (the Hare system of majority preferential voting) used in single-member districts in most of the province and the Hare system of P.R. used in the two five-member districts of Calgary and Edmonton.

The contest this time was between the Social Credit organization, which swept the province outside the two largest cities in a landslide the time before, and various conservative elements running as "Independents." The United Farmers of Alberta, which formerly controlled the province but were

wiped out by the Social Credit landslide, were to be found partly in the Social Credit ranks and partly in the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation, which ran a poor third.

Though the margin of Social Credit was considerably reduced, it once more elected members out of all proportion to its voting strength. With less than 43 per cent of the total first-choice vote it elected 35 out of 56, or 63 per cent of the members.

This disparity in voting power was created almost entirely by the operation of the majority system, outside the two P. R. cities. In this area it took almost twice as many votes on the average to elect an Independent member as a Social Credit man, and the Coöperative Commonwealth Federation, with eight times as many votes as the number of Social Credit votes for each member elected, got no representation at all.

The results for the majority area may be summarized as follows:

OUTSIDE THE TWO LARGEST CITIES
ALTERNATIVE VOTE

Party	*First Choice Votes*	*Members Elected*	*Members in Proportion to Votes*
Social Credit	101,165	31	21.2
Independent	82,975	13	17.4
C.C.F.	25,906	0	5.5
Others	9,161	2	1.9
	219,207	46	46

In contrast to this the use of P.R. in Calgary and Edmonton resulted as follows:

CALGARY AND EDMONTON—P.R.

Party	*First Choice Votes*	*Members Elected*	*Members in Proportion to Votes*
Social Credit	31,342	4	3.5
Independent	48,197	6	5.4
C.C.F.	8,410	0	.9
Others	1,708	0	.2
	89,657	10	10

The Coöperative Commonwealth Federation failed to win a seat because its votes were divided between the two cities in such a way that it did not approach the minimum quota in either. In each city the Independents won three seats and Social Credit two, which was the fairest possible division of the five seats on the basis of the votes cast.

The alternative vote used in the single-member districts had the merit of preventing a minority from winning in any district at the expense of a divided majority. In Olds, for example, the Independent led on first choices because the Social Credit forces were split between two candidates, but when the independent S.C. candidate was defeated as being lowest of the three contestants and his votes transferred to next choices, it was clearly demonstrated that more voters preferred the regular Social Credit candidate than the Independent. In St. Albert the situation was reversed and an Independent won out on transfers.

But since only one person was to be elected in each district, the minority in each district necessarily went unrepresented even under the best of preferential systems; and these unrepresented remainders so far threw off the true proportions that a party with far less than half the votes won a good majority of the seats. Only by electing several together from a district and dividing the seats proportionately among the competing groups of electors, as in Calgary and Edmonton, can such distortions of the popular will be avoided.

The P. R. League, as announced in this department last month, invites every member of the National Municipal League to enroll as a P. R. member without additional dues by writing to Elsie S. Parker at the N. M. League office.

Books in Review

EDITED BY ELSIE S. PARKER

The Boss. By Dayton D. McKean. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940. xvii, 285 pp. $3.

Before accepting his present position on the Dartmouth College Faculty, Professor McKean served in the New Jersey legislature and on various administrative boards in that state. On the basis of his legislative experiences he published a widely read thesis entitled *Pressures on the Legislature of New Jersey.* Like that work, his new volume is a comprehensive accumulation of data, interestingly written and selected.

Its highly sensational content and colorful subject matter has given the book an extremely wide appeal for a work on city government. And it is, of course, primarily, a serious study of city government—a description of a phenomenon that is unfortunately rather typical of urban politics in America. The rise of Frank Hague, a conspicuously unpromising son of a poor blacksmith of the railroad yards, to the most powerful position in the state is much more fascinating than an Alger story, and considerably more realistic. McKean describes in detail the various steps that he travelled, and the various political, economic, and ecclesiastical groups that contributed to his eventual success. He records the deals that Hague entered into with the Republican party, in order to eliminate Democrats whose presence threatened his power, and does not spare the corrupt leadership of the Republican party of New Jersey, whose leaders have always been willing to respect Hague's territory in the north if he would leave them theirs in the south.

Professor McKean's work, however, is neither a work of mature scholarship nor of incisive reporting. But it is a straightforward, honest, and courageous account of a political machine and the factors which contributed to its continued dominance. In effect, a guidebook and a challenge to reformers, and a warning to lazy citizens, has been fashioned out of the bar-room myths and legends that have circulated around Jersey City for decades.

There will be those who will point out the inadequacy of McKean's documentation: but an independent investigator of political corruption must always rely chiefly upon rumor and gossip. It is difficult to see how he could do otherwise, with the limited time, money, and investigatory power at his command.

It is rather depressing to read this book in conjunction with the essay on Mark Fagan, Frank Hague's immediate predecessor, in Lincoln Steffen's collection, *Upbuilders.* The hope which that great reporter held forth for the west bank of the Hudson seems woefully unfulfilled. Mark Fagan, the noble and truly heroic figure around whom Steffens centered his sanguine description of the forces which were at work to build a newer and better Jersey, has for twenty years been quietly and humbly practicing his old calling of undertaker in Jersey City's poorest district.

JEROME H. SPINGARN

Adjusted Rents. A report on the adjustment of rents in public housing projects to family income. New York City, Committee on Housing, Community Service Society of New York, 1940. 52 pp. 25 cents.

This is the most satisfactory and comprehensive analysis of the rent adjustment problem that has come to my attention. It presents no final conclusions, but the evidence and discus-

sion of the available facts and experience in the United States and in England clarify the value of rent adjustment and its various possibilities in relation to the factors which determine the needs for rent adjustment.

The report should prove particularly valuable as a stimulus to further study of the questions raised. We shall need in the future a whole system of legislative rent controls and subsidy policies intended to bring public housing closer to the people for whom such housing is intended. A clarification of the seven questions which in my estimation the report so clearly brings into focus should be basic to any rent policies in public housing which may be devised by federal, state, local or private agencies dealing with the relation of rent to incomes and essential family budget requirements. The Committee on Housing of the Community Service Society of New York, in issuing the report, has performed a very valuable service in the cause of bringing the benefits of public housing closer to those who should benefit by such housing.

CAROL ARONOVICI

Research Methods in Public Administration. By John M. Pfiffner. New York City, The Ronald Press Company, 1940. xv, 447 pp. $4.50.

This book is far more than its preface declares it to be. It is a textbook in the methodology of social science that will guide the student throughout college and post-graduate years so completely that when he has finished he will realize he has a thorough knowledge of the subject of governmental research.

Its comprehensiveness is at once its strength and its weakness, and which is which only the "shake-down" process of using it can show. For instance, the first chapter, "What is Research," deals with such tools of thinking as induction and deduction. Yet there is an old-fashioned flavor in its writing that suggests notes from lectures in logic as it was taught forty years ago. On the other hand the chapter contains, and suggests as supplemental reading, some of the best writing available on the scientific method.

There is a sentence on page 157 which is a comment on the chapter containing it: "Some of the observations contained herein would undoubtedly seem elementary or even naïve to advanced workers." The comment applies to the entire book and will be the reaction of many who cannot qualify as advanced workers, particularly when they read "Personal Characteristics of the Interviewer," pp. 188-189. On the other hand, if one starts with the postulate that the students who use this book are callow the advice given is needful.

The book is a bold attempt to dispel the dismay of those who, having grasped the importance of social research and the opportunities it offers to those who live to serve instead of to get, discover that to become proficient is another case of, "the lyf so shorte, the crafte so long to lerne." In the hands of discriminating teachers and pupils it should achieve a notable success in dispelling such fears and shorten the necessary apprenticeship.

W. J. M.

County Government and Administration in the Tennessee Valley States. By M. H. Satterfield. Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1940. ix, 144 pp.

This report, issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority, is a most effective presentation of county government in the valley states. By judicious use of tables and footnotes, and by simplicity and clarity of style, Mr. Satterfield has

presented a mass of information with a minimum of the cataloguing effect.

The seven states included in the study are Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Kentucky. Major topics discussed in the report are administrative organization, finance, highways, education, health and welfare, law enforcement, planning and zoning, and the consolidation of areas and functions. Descriptive detail and analysis are based on extensive use of laws, surveys, and reports as well as on secondary literature.

The interpretations and conclusions of the author are not novel, but they are based on conservative aspirations for governmental reform in this most laggard field. He suggests that frequently county boards are too large, such as one in Tennessee with fifty-two members. They should be elected at large, and where a conflict between urban and rural interests exists, it could be resolved by a system of proportional representation. Furthermore, he believes the board has much too limited control over administration. It should have complete responsibility for all county functions. He thinks the most promising devices are the county manager and executive plans, but due to a variety of reasons counties probably will continue to be slow in adopting them.

The author believes that the unification of functions, especially fiscal, is needed badly in the valley counties. He thinks a single department should be responsible for assessing property, collection of all revenues, the budget, accounting, control over spending agencies, and financial reporting.

The author stresses also the need for sound procedures in budgeting, accounting, and reporting. Since these functions should be uniform throughout the state, they should be supervised by a state agency which has full power of enforcement.

Although the author recognizes the need for consolidation of counties and for city-county consolidation, he does not believe that permissive legislation such as that found in two states will be effective.

Functional consolidation is much more prevalent in the valley states, but the author is distrustful of it. He believes the major solution will lie in the transfer of many functions to higher units.

E. A. M.

Additional Books and Reports

Accounting

Central Control of Municipal Accounts in Louisiana. An analysis of the Situation in Louisiana, an Examination of Practice in Other States, and a Proposal for Action. By Clarence Scheps. University, Bureau of Government Research, Louisiana State University, 1941. 15 pp. 25 cents; 10 cents for additional copies.

Data Concerning the Accounting Activities of City Clerks in Sixth-Class Cities of California. By Paul Beckett. Los Angeles, Bureau of Government Research, University of California, 1941. 8 pp. mimeo.

Apportionment

Congressional Apportionment. By Laurence F. Schmeckebier. Washington, D. C., The Brookings Institution, 1941. x, 233 pp. $2.50.

Legislative Apportionment. Berkeley, Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, 1941. 46 pp. mimeo.

Methods of Apportionment in Congress. A Survey. By Edward V. Huntington. (Senate Document No. 304.) Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1940. v, 41 pp.

Blighted Areas

Blighted Urban Areas and Their Rehabilitation. A Selected List of References. Chicago, American Society of Planning Officials, 1940. 13 pp. mimeo. 25 cents.

Citizenship and Democracy

America's Last Chance. By Albert Carr. New York City, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1940. 328 pp. $2.75.

Democracy Comes to a Cotton Kingdom. The Story of Mexico's La Laguna. By Clarence Senior. Mexico, D. F., Centro de Estudios Pedagogicos E Hispano Americanos, 1940. (Distributed in the United States by the League for Industrial Democracy, New York City.) 56 pp. 15 cents.

Democratic Education. Suggestions for Education and National Defense. By Progressive Education Association. Washington, D. C., American Council on Public Affairs, 1940. 22 pp. 25 cents.

Education in Citizenship. The Organization of a Citizenship Program for Young Voters. By Harold M. Dorr. Ann Arbor, Extension Service, University of Michigan, 1940. 11 pp.

Freedom of Assembly and Anti-Democratic Groups. A Memorandum of the Council for Democracy. Washington, D. C., American Council on Public Affairs, 1941. 27 pp. 25 cents.

Illinois Program of Citizenship Training for First Voters. By Neil F. Garvey. Urbana, University of Illinois, 1941. 10 pp. mimeo.

Student Coöperation. A Report of Student Government in High Schools. By Earl C. Kelley. New York City, National Self Government Committee, Inc., 1941. 20 pp. 10 cents.

The Clash of Political Ideals. A Source Book on Democracy, Communism, and the Totalitarian State. Selected and Annotated by Albert R. Chandler. New York City, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940. xvii, 273 pp. Student edition, $2.

Your Business as a Voter. A Handbook of Essential Facts about Voting in Illinois. By Neil Ford Garvey, Richard G. Browne, and William G. Wood. Urbana, University of Illinois, 1941. 64 pp.

Defense

City Problems and Defense 1941. The Proceedings of the St. Louis Regional Conference of the United States Conference of Mayors. Edited by Paul V. Betters. Washington, D. C., The United States Conference of Mayors, 1941. 94 pp. $3.

Community Employment Problems under Defense. A Memorandum of the Council for Democracy. Washington, D. C., American Council on Public Affairs, 1941. iv, 23 pp. 25 cents.

Defense and the Consumer. By Institute for Consumer Education. New York City, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 1941. 32 pp. 10 cents.

Defense Statistics Related to Local Markets. New York City, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., 1941. 18 pp.

Financing National Defense. By Robert S. Ford. Ann Arbor, Bureau of Government, University of Michigan, 1941. 28 pp. 10 cents.

Fundamental Economic Issues in National Defense. By Harold G. Moulton. Washington, D. C., Brookings Institution, 1941. 32 pp. 25 cents.

How Shall We Pay for Defense. By Maxwell S. Stewart. New York City, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 1941. 32 pp. 10 cents.

Labor and National Defense. A Survey of the Special Labor Problems Arising from America's Defense Activities and a Program for Action. The Factual Findings by Lloyd G. Reynolds; The Program by The Labor Committee. New York City, Twentieth Century Fund, 1941. xiii, 130 pp. $1.00.

Unemployment and Defense. A Movie

Discussion Guide. (A Defense Digest.) New York City, American Association for Adult Education, 1941. 15 pp. 10 cents.

Housing

Defense Housing in Our Town. The Community's Problem in Providing Homes for Workers in Defense Industries. New York City, Twentieth Century Fund, 1941. 13 pp. 2 cents each in quantities up to 500; 1½ cents over 500.

Housing for Citizens. (A Defense Digest.) New York City, American Association for Adult Education, 1941. 13 pp. 10 cents.

Suggested Emergency Fair Rent Legislation. A Report. By Consumer Division, National Defense Advisory Commission. Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1941. v, 21 pp.

Liquor Control

Liquor Taxes and Public Welfare. By Harley L. Lutz, Paul Studenski, etc. New York City, *Journal of Commerce and Commercial,* 1941. 56 pp. $1.

Miscellaneous

American Year Book. A Record of Events and Progress for 1940. Edited by William M. Schuyler and Albert Bushnell Hart. New York City, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1941. xxiii, 1,079 pp. $7.50.

Definite Sentence Laws, Parole Organization and Reparole. Springfield, Research Department, Illinois Legislative Council, 1941. 31 pp. mimeo.

Government and Business. A Manual and Syllabus. By Russell H. Ewing. Denver, Colorado, School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, University of Denver, 1940. 132 pp. $1.

Growth and Decline of Agricultural Villages. By David R. Jenkins. New York City, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940. v, 95 pp. $1.60.

Matching Youth and Jobs. A Study of Occupational Adjustment. By Howard M. Bell. Prepared for the American Youth Commission. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1940. xiii, 277 pp. $2.

Opinions of the Corporation Counsel and Assistants, January 1, 1938, to January 1, 1940, and Cumulative Index to Opinion Volumes I to XX, 1872 to 1940. Edited and Compiled by Barnet Hodes, Corporation Counsel. Chicago, Department of Law, 1940.

Registration of Births in Nebraska. Lincoln, Research Department, Nebraska Legislative Council, 1940. 7 pp. mimeo.

Regulation of Neon Signs. By Charles C. Weinstein. New York City, City Club, 1940. 7 pp.

Regulation of the Use of Groundwater in Nebraska. Lincoln, Research Department, Nebraska Legislative Council, 1940. 15 pp. mimeo.

Removal of Judges. By Albert I. Edelman. New York City, City Club, 1941. 13 pp.

Social Work Year Book 1941. Edited by Russell H. Kurtz. Part I: An Authoritative Record of Organized Activities; Part II: A Directory of 1,023 National and State Agencies in Social Work and Related Fields. New York City, Russell Sage Foundation, 1941. 793 pp. $3.25.

Solicitations for Charitable Purposes. A Report by the Research Department, City of Houston, Texas, 1940. 16 pp. mimeo.

State Aid for Driver Training Courses. Springfield, Research Department, Illinois Legislative Council, 1940. 16 pp. mimeo.

State Regulation of Weights and Measures. Review of Present Administrative Organization in Kansas, Possibilities for a More Comprehensive and Coördinated System, and Regulation in Other States. Topeka, Kansas Legislative Council, 1940. x, 23 pp.